DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 427 SO 022 914

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake, Ed.
TITLE Peace Education around the World. Some Expert Interviews. Educational Information and Debate 97.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-0479-7736
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 95p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Malmo School of Education, Lund University, Box 23501, S-200, 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; International Education; *Interviews; *Peace; *Role of Education; War
IDENTIFIERS Europe; Japan; New Zealand; *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

The project group "Preparedness for Peace," working at the Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Malmo School of Education in Sweden, explores ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of its work, the project group collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness." A number of experts with special interests and competences in areas related to peace education have been interviewed. This report presents such conversations with 10 experts: James Calleja (from Malta), James Collinge (New Zealand); Henk B. Gerritsma and Daan Verbaan (The Netherlands), Petra Hesse (the United States), David Hicks (England), Mitsuo Okamoto (Japan), Paul Rogers (Northern Ireland) and Maura Ward (Ireland), and Bogdan Rowinski (Poland). (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 427

[redacted]

ÅKE BJERSTEDT (ED.)

MSE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AKE BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 914

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEACE EDUCATION AROUND THE WORLD

Some expert interviews

Editor:
Åke Bjerstedt

Malmö, Sweden: School of Education, 1992

Published and distributed by:
Department of Educational and Psychological Research
School of Education, Box 23501
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden

Printed by:
Graphic Systems, Malmö, Sweden

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
James Calleja (Malta)	7
James Collinge (New Zealand)	16
Henk B. Gerritsma & Daan Verbaan (The Netherlands)	28
Petra Hesse (USA)	43
David Hicks (England)	60
Mitsuo Okamoto (Japan)	70
Paul Rogers (Northern Ireland) & Maura Ward (Ireland)	78
Bogdan Rowiński (Poland)	87

INTRODUCTION

The project group "Preparedness for Peace", working at the Department of Educational and Psychological Research, the Malmö School of Education in Sweden, explores ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of its work, the project group collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness". A number of experts with special interest and competence in areas related to peace education have been interviewed.

This report presents such conversations with ten experts (representing England, Ireland, Japan, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Poland, and the United States). Interviewer: Åke Bjerstedt.

Related books in the same publication series ("Educational Information and Debate") are: "Peace education in different countries" (No. 81, 1988); "Perspectives on peace education" (No. 89, 1990); "Education for peace: Ten voices" (No. 94, 1991); and "Comprehensive peace education: A bibliography" (No. 96, 1992).

Å.B.

JAMES CALLEJA (MALTA)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

JC: I am a graduate in education of the University of Malta from where I obtained my Bachelor's Degree. Then I moved on to the University of Padua in Italy where I undertook research in the philosophy of education. I recently got my Ph.D. from the Department of Peace Studies of the University of Bradford. My thesis dealt with Kant's philosophy of peace and history.

I got interested in peace education mainly after I had met Helena Kekkonen in 1987. After that I was given the opportunity in Malta, through the Foundation for International Studies, to start a program on peace education. We first organized a national seminar for teachers in particular, education advisers and principals from both public and private schools. Helena Kekkonen was then invited, to give some lectures. The proceedings of that seminar were published in a book (Calleja, J., Busuttil, S. & Kekkonen, H. /Eds./ Directions in the study of peace education. Valletta, Malta: Said, 1991). This was the first national seminar on the topic in Malta, and I am pleased to say that the academic study of peace education in Malta as such started with this national seminar. This was in 1989.

Two units of studies in this area in the faculty of education of the University of Malta were then introduced. One concerns the theoretical perspectives on peace and education and the other is on the practical dimensions of peace education. Our student teachers at our faculty of education have now an opportunity to choose these units during their course of studies. They are not compulsory. They are optional, but already we have had about 60 students. Hence, 60 of our future teachers already have some basic information and have done some research on peace education.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

JC: I think the word peace and the word education are the two most important words in our vocabulary. Basically our philosophy in Malta, if I may say so, focuses on peace education as that area of study where education influences peace strategies and peace strategies would influence education. We work on a concept which does *not* focus on peace as being the

absence of something. Very often we hear that peace is the absence of structural or direct violence. With our students we try to undertake research leading to a concept of peace which is the presence or the essence of something else.

ÅB: When you think of the goals of peace education, as you see them, would they include more than knowledge? Would you, for example, also try to promote certain values?

JC: You can look at peace education as education *about* peace or education *for* peace. Basically what we do with our students is that we try to inculcate the idea that peace education is a dynamic process which they themselves could start on the basis of some theoretical framework that they themselves have personally discovered from readings, group discussions and research. This is why we have two units. What I teach is the theoretical background, with normally classical texts. It is a history of the ideas on peace. Then the second unit focuses on practical strategies in the classrooms, how to put these theories into practice. One important project which my students are working on at the moment is a manual for teachers in the primary school entitled "Education for Mutual Respect": A Teacher's Manual for the Study of Peace Education. I have given my students sort of a skeleton draft of the manual which we discussed and which we change and add to as we go along. In the appendix of this manual, we shall give – which I think is extremely important – some guidelines to the relevant literature, for example, texts on the United Nations as an organization, literature on peace studies in general and on the philosophy of peace, and some literature on the Mediterranean. We want to give to Maltese teachers (who never had the opportunity to deal with peace education), an idea of what peace education is all about and give them some background. So we are working on this manual this year for primary school education, hoping that next year we proceed to secondary education and then to the incorporation of peace studies at the university level.

ÅB: Will this manual then be published and made available for teachers?

JC: Yes, this is our idea. After editing etc., this will be a manual which we will definitely distribute to teachers in our schools.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

JC: In my own school days, nothing was heard about peace education. Some form of concept related to peace education may have been at the back of

some teachers' mind. But definitely, there was no mentioning of peace education or anything which has to do with peace education. In fact, the schooling was very much competitive, so the values of peace could not really be said to be present.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

JC: The existing social studies syllabus does have an element of peace education. As I said before, we started in 1987 thinking of doing serious work on peace education. We are lucky to have a Minister of Education who is very much in favour of introducing peace education in our schools. Of course, he wants to see more concrete examples of this and of our work with student teachers. Our perspective is to start a top-down approach, that is to say, we first embark on research, then draft the programs, and then introduce peace education in schools. We want to make sure that our future teachers have enough knowledge and background in peace education so that when they would see the syllabus in front of their eyes they would not be surprised. We are training the trainers. This is where we have started.

ÅB: You said that there is an element of peace education in social studies. Could you say something more about that?

JC: You might find some elements of peace education in the civics classes or some others in the history lessons at primary level. But this is very little, almost insignificant.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

JC: Yes, I do believe, of course, that schools can contribute to peace education. If not schools, who could do this? I think it is the task of schools, both private and public, to incorporate peace education in the syllabus.

ÅB: What is the situation in Malta with respect to private and public schools?

JC: One third of our school population goes to private schools, two thirds to government schools. We have to make sure that the values of peace education are inculcated in both. So far private school education has been more inclined to include peace education than government schools. Some experiments have already been undertaken in private schools, and we are

very much satisfied by their reception, and we want to make use of this interest in peace education of private schools to encourage government schools to take up the idea as well. With regards to steps and measures, as I mentioned before, we started with student teachers. That does not mean that other initiatives have not been undertaken, such as ad hoc lectures or small study circles, but basically we want our student teachers to help in drafting the programs to be implemented in schools later on. This is our strategy.

ÅB: When you think of teachers' steps and measures right in the classroom, what is the first thing you come to think of?

JC: We favour an integrated approach. We have invited some of the teachers to give us their ideas, with respect to particular school subjects, about how they themselves would incorporate the values of peace within their subject, and we have had some encouraging results there. Since our syllabi in primary school education do give you flexibility, primary school teachers have also experimented with this kind of approach and have given us feedback on what they think about it. In the area of teaching practice, the student teachers try out some approaches and they report back to us.

Before we started with the projects and the national seminar, we had several meetings with higher authorities on this. In fact, if you have a look at the report of the national seminar, you would see that, for example, the President of Malta opened the seminar. It was a symbolic gesture, but we wanted to make sure that our authorities were au courant with what we were doing, that we had their moral support. It was an example of confidence building between the grass-root levels and the top-levels, and it *did* make a significant difference. We were of course also very honored and pleased to have the Minister of Education of Malta, Dr. Ugo Mifsud Bonnici address the seminar twice.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

JC: With younger students we emphasize the arts and games. For example, a set of games have been drafted, based on cooperation strategies in the classroom. An exchange program was held with the University of Jyväskylä. My student teachers worked on a project on cooperation strategies in the classroom. The same was done by the other student teachers from Jyväskylä, and when we met, we developed through discussion a comparative study, and we discussed what we mean by cooperation, how this could be developed, where it would lead to and what we are trying to

achieve through cooperation. We are now at a stage, with some of the students, to discover how the concepts of peace, communication, cooperation and confidence building, could be developed into tuition packages which students themselves could use, with the help of teachers, of course. This is with younger students.

With older students we have worked, for example, with newspapers cuttings, commenting events and with videos, depending on the interests that the students have and what they themselves propose. With older students, we prefer to ask the students what they themselves would prefer to discuss in terms of peace. It is marvellous how many ideas come out! We sort of leave the initiatives in their hands, and then we act as facilitators or mediators.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

JC: One important thing here is that the upper-secondary school teacher himself has to have some background in peace education. This is a sine qua non. We cannot expect teachers at whatever level they are teaching to introduce and incorporate peace education without they themselves have had some training in it.

Let's take a language subject as for example Italian or English. Most of the proposals we had from upper-secondary school teachers were to try to incorporate peace education through literature itself or by using drama. There are also ideas on setting up exhibitions. The students themselves would work on and prepare exhibitions. Another idea that came up was using questionnaires that the students themselves would like to work upon. So these were some ideas which came from dialogues with upper-secondary school teachers.

Of course, we have various pressures on our students and teachers at this level. The students have to sit for formal examinations to enter university, so it is very difficult to include peace education within the programs of studies, especially if students are given the impression that what they are doing is something "extra". Therefore, it has to be integrated in the ordinary work and seen as relevant also in practical terms.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

JC: I am very much involved in international education. I think that the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" could all be incorporated under one heading, that is to say "international education".

We have a tendency to call our own program a program of "international education" and then include peace studies within "international education". From a Unesco Tunis meeting, which was held late in September 1991, this was one of the themes which was debated during the three-day seminar: What should fall under "international education"? The two subjects that were seen as legitimate topics to be discussed under "international education" were precisely "peace education" and "human rights education". I think there was considerable agreement on this. So I would prefer to include under the word "international education" peace education and human rights education and stop at that, rather than carry on with "environment education" etc. As peace researchers or as peace educators I think we should be very specific on what to look into rather than open up to too many areas. Peace education should not be an umbrella concept but specifically concerned with the education *about* peace and *for* peace; peace as communication, cooperation, confidence building.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

JC: One of the problems of peace education in the Mediterranean area has always been related to the fact that peace has very much been associated with politics. It would be more agreeable to parents, more acceptable to our children and to our authorities, if we *do not* correlate peace with politics. The difficulties arise when this correlation takes place. If we remain on the level of values, then the problems will be less. This is one of the reasons why we are working very hard on a concept of peace as communication, cooperation and confidence building. Difficulties arise if people think that we are trying to create a sort of new form of political or religious move-

ment, since it is the politician or/and the "religious" person who normally speak about peace.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

JC: Teacher training is extremely important. As I have said before, you cannot expect miracles in our classrooms, teachers have to be trained, they have to be given concepts and practice in peace education. They have to do their own things, they have to make up their own frame of mind, they have to do their own research. It can be integrated in various subjects in the program of teacher training from psychology to philosophy of education. What minimizes conflicts? What starts conflicts? Such questions could be tackled in psychology of education with a peace perspective.

Teachers themselves can work on tuition models which they themselves can apply later on in the area. From my experience the moment a teacher is given a book or a text which is not directly related to the subject he or she is working upon, there might be complete rejection. It works better if the teacher himself creates his own material, based of course on other materials, but something which he himself has done and now feels he can put into practice. This I found to be more useful than any other methodology.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

JC: We have had some experience of this kind of peace education with students representing a variety of nationalities. I am referring to the experiments we had in 1987 and 1991 with what we call "The United World College Mediterranean Project". One of The United World Colleges is in Trieste in Italy, with students from different nationalities. Two summer schools were jointly organized by the College of Trieste and a group of students from Upper Secondary Schools in Malta. A theme related to peace education was chosen as a constant point of reference in discussions, seminars and community work. What is important to highlight from this experience is that the students themselves worked together for three weeks. They had community work in the morning, seminars in the afternoon, and leisure activities in the evening. They also lived together, and this was one

of the main ideas behind the exercise: that the students live together and share their experiences. It really worked out well. I was very pleased with both experiments, and I cannot see why it cannot work in the future. There are financial difficulties in this, however. You have to secure a budget.

ÅB: Would there be different ethnic groups within the schools of Malta itself?

JC: No, Malta is a fairly homogeneous population. We have a culture which is European and Mediterranean at the same time. Politics might have been a source of division in the past, but today I am pleased to say that this obstacle has been intelligently overcome. Since we have a two-party system, you might encounter a segregating element of politics among students and teachers in the same school. But this is not a major problem.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

JC: As I indicated before, my idea is that the more content areas you include, the more you could disorient your students and confuse yourself. I am not saying that environmental education should not be part of peace education. I am simply saying that it is related. It should be given space within peace education, but it should not be highly emphasized. Educators with special training in environmental education should take care of the more detailed analysis of environmental damage. My own idea is that peace educators should really concentrate on the values of peace and the possible incorporation of peace education into the existent systems of education.

13.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

JC: Education acts in various countries should include peace education in education programs. It should be enforced. It might not be very much in line with the values of peace education if you impose things, but peace education can only get credibility as a subject if it has a legal foot to stand on.

ÅB: Do you think of it as a separate subject or do you think of it as some-

thing that is integrated in other subjects?

JC: There are various views on this. With the amount of subjects one finds on the curriculum, if one had to add peace education as a separate subject, the student would perhaps get one dose of peace education once every fortnight, whereas with an integrated approach he or she might get one small dose every day. I would be very much in favour of giving small doses every day rather than one more specific dose every fortnight. So I am for the integrated approach, and I think that is the most feasible and most practical way of incorporating peace education. Of course, you find various theories on this, but I think experiments with peace education as a separate subject will fail because these do not fit the very philosophy of peace education.

One basic thing one should keep in mind for the future is that teachers have to be trained, so that they themselves know exactly what they are talking about. At the present moment, many countries have no elements of peace education training at all in teacher education programmes. One cannot expect peace to flow from ignorance. Normally where there is ignorance, there is conflict.

JAMES COLLINGE (NEW ZEALAND)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

JC: I first became interested in peace issues in the 1960s when I was very much involved in the campaign for nuclear disarmament, to some extent in Britain, where I lived for some time. I was working in the campaign for nuclear disarmament in Auckland in New Zealand. I was on the committe of that campaign. I was also involved in the anti-Vietnam war movement in the 1960s and have for many years been involved in the anti-apartheid movement.

I have taught both in primary and secondary school. My first job was teaching music, and I have always had a great interest in the arts in education and its relationship with peace education, particularly through the work of Herbert Read, whom I have studied especially and dealt with in a thesis.

I first became interested in teaching peace education in universities in the middle of the 1980s. We had a new government in New Zealand in 1984 which had a strong interest in peace issues and which declared New Zealand nuclear free. We have a Minister of Disarmament in the government. The Minister of Education was very enthusiastic about the notion of peace education. I felt that there was going to be a lot of development in the schools and that, as a result, I should start a course at the university. The first year that was taught was in 1985 and I have taught it regularly ever since. This has now developed into the postgraduate area: I have a master's course in peace education and a number of thesis students who are working in the field. This has proved to be an extremely popular course in the university, at times one of the most popular in our department.

ÅB: What kind of students would come to this course?

JC: Many of our students are either teachers who are already teaching (some of them quite senior teachers who are coming back to university) or they are teachers in training, student teachers. But we do have a lot of other students who have very wide interests. We have in our department a lot of older students who have come back to the university or start at the university when their children are growing up. Many of them have a great deal of interest in peace education through raising children; they want their children to grow up in a more peaceful world. So I have quite a number of people who come to my course as parents rather than as teachers or student

teachers. But I have had a very wide range of students; last year for example, I had two people from the military.

ÅB: Is your course more or less unique in your country or are there similar courses in other places?

JC: It was the first to be started. I started it as a trial course – what we would call a special field – for three years, and then it was so successful that I managed to get it accepted as a permanent course. The master's course was brought in later. There was some opposition within the university to the course being introduced, but at the time, I was on leave, so I did not hear it directly. But I heard later that people had said: Is this really the sort of course we ought to be teaching in the university?

ÅB: How would you describe the content and character of the course briefly?

JC: First of all I try to run it in a way that gives the maximum amount of opportunity for students to develop their individual work, so I do not give many lectures. We meet in groups of about 8 or 9 students regularly for seminar work. There is a great deal of emphasis on cooperative work. Students discuss their work with other students, sharing their work with other students. When we meet for lectures, to a large extent I try to get visiting people from the peace movement or other peace educators, or people like guidance counsellors who have been involved in conflict resolution in schools.

The content of the course is to a large extent as wide as the students want to make it, but we do have a strong emphasis on understanding conflict resolution in schools. Many of the students who are student teachers use the opportunity to develop curriculum materials. My students are, for example, very interested in environmental questions and so we spend quite a lot of time on environmental questions and their relation with peace. We deal with social justice and education in a multi-cultural society. We have also studied specific Maori approaches to the study of peace and we have then looked at some of the background of this in Maori history. For example, in the late nineteenth century there were two Maori leaders who developed non-violent means of protest, similar to the work of Gandhi. Some of my students have developed curriculum materials so that these Maori examples can be used in the schools.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

JC: I see it as two things. I see it first of all as a curriculum question, that is when peace topics are discussed with young people. I feel it is extremely important to put such topics before young people and help them to develop critical attitudes, critical approaches to the important questions of peace and war, defence, violence in the community and violence in the media. I think that I would call this "peace studies" rather than peace education; I want to make that distinction.

When I think of peace education, I think of it as more than that, I think of it as a sort of global approach, and peace education to me entails also the means by which you teach. It means that you teach in a way that gives the maximum opportunity for students to develop their own approaches to the work rather than having this laid down by the teacher. You teach in ways that emphasize cooperation rather than competition. You teach in an environment – and that is not just a classroom environment but a whole school environment – that emphasizes peaceful resolution of conflicts rather than formal discipline and that uses a whole set of processes that give people the opportunity to develop cooperative and democratic procedures. So the process to me is as important as the actual topics. That is what I think of as peace education. When I am feeling braver I use the expression "education for peace" rather than "peace education".

ÅB: What is the official name of your own course?

JC: It is "peace education".

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

JC: I think the short answer would be: No. I do not think there was anything that could be called peace education in the primary school at that time – except some attempts at understanding people from other countries in social studies and some attempts at doing work in Maori culture, but these were taught in a very remote sort of way almost as though they were remote people. There were Maori students in our classes and they would almost be learning about Maori culture as though they were another sort of people as well, so it was very remote. At the secondary school: No. I went to a very formal boys' grammar school in Auckland, and in many ways I would look back on that school as being a very violent school. There was a lot of bullying as in many boys' schools at that time, a great deal of emphasis on discipline, there was a lot of corporal punishment. I would think that in many ways the education of this school would be the exact

opposite of peace education. At the end of my five years in that school I was very glad to leave, and I have never been back to the school since.

A.-

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

JC: I think that there are a lot of teachers who are very interested in peace education, but I think that they probably work with some difficulties. Curriculum questions are very difficult in New Zealand at the moment because of the changes. One of my colleagues said in an article about curriculum in New Zealand that it is like a village which has been hit by the eruption of a volcano: there is something down there somewhere, but the whole structure has been destroyed and the people are wandering around trying to look for it. But within the curriculum there is still a lot of emphasis on what we might call education for international understanding. One of my students did a thesis recently on global education in New Zealand, and he found when he went to talk to some of the people in the Ministry of Education that they were in fact very interested and supportive of this. Within the health education syllabus I think that there is a great deal of emphasis on cooperation and on conflict resolution as part of developing a healthy self concept. We use the term "health education", but it is very much wider than just physical health. It also includes healthy relationships between people, the development of positive self-concepts and a whole range of things like that. It is a very wide syllabus which has been developed, and I think it is a lot in there that might be regarded as peace education.

ÅB: Is that for all stages at school?

JC: It is for the primary school and through to the first two years of secondary school, so up til about the age of 14 or 15. Our children start at the age of five in schools, so it ranges from age 5 to about 14.

When it comes to topics such as nuclear questions, defence or violence, I do not see a great deal of evidence that those topics are discussed in school now. But of course there has been a great change in the last few years in our country, especially since the new government got in, very much opposed to peace education. The teachers are still very interested in peace education, but the development of this area is now more "underground" than earlier.

Some of the peace movements in New Zealand, for example Peace Movement Aotearoa and The New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies,

are good sources of material for use in schools and actively support peace education. There is also an organization Students and Teachers Organization for Peace (STOP) but I don't know how active they are at the moment. Play for Life is particularly concerned with discouraging the sale of war toys in our shops, encouraging alternative peaceful games and opposing violence on TV particularly in children's programmes. And I must also mention the work of Alyn Ware and the Peace Van which he takes around schools talking to classes, giving exhibitions and showing materials. These organizations are always very short of money and exist because of energetic and dedicated people.

The report of the Commission on Violence in New Zealand (1987), the Roper Report, strongly advocated that Peace Education should be introduced to schools at all levels. There has recently been renewed concern at the level of violence in New Zealand, so maybe the recommendations of the Roper Report will be rediscovered, although I am not too hopeful.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

JC: Yes, I think it is possible, and I think one of the first things that must be done in the school is to develop more cooperative, democratic ways of working within the school. There is something contradictory about a school that might teach peace topics in the classroom and yet operate in authoritarian and non-democratic ways. There is a parallel in Kohlberg's work on moral education; he said that it is a waste of time trying to teach moral education in a school that does not operate in a moral way when trying to solve moral problems. With peace education, the school should develop more democratic structures, more cooperation, more emphasis on conflict resolution rather than trying to solve conflict by discipline and authoritarian methods. I think that it is important and I am particularly interested in the upper levels of the school here.

I think it is also important for young people to be challenged to think about – I don't want to say "be taught about", but be challenged to think about – critically the major peace issues. To me, an education that does not challenge people to think about the crucial questions of war, peace, defence, nuclear question and related questions of justice, of the environment, is a severely deficient education. I think it is necessary for schools to develop various sorts of measures to do this, because it seems to me that – certainly

in New Zealand – a lot of young people would say that parents do not talk with us about these things; we want to talk with adults, we want to have the opportunity to study these sorts of issues. The school is the obvious place to do so.

ÅB: If we talk about this area in terms of the goals that peace education should strive for, they would obviously include knowledge and some thinking about peace issues. Would you also include certain kinds of attitudes or values or behavior tendencies?

JC: Yes, I would. I think it is important to strive towards having an attitude that it is important to be able to cooperate. I have a strong feeling that unless our species learns to cooperate, we will not survive. I think it is an important attitude to learn to solve our conflicts between each other in non-violent ways. I think that peace education must stimulate positive attitudes towards the environment and towards global questions. I think it is very important that we develop knowledge and understanding of the interrelatedness of human beings with each other and human beings with the environment and also I want to make a very strong connection between peace education and positive attitudes towards justice or concern for justice and concern for the elimination of racism. As we have seen in a number of countries, particularly as they have an economic recession, very often racist questions come up. We have seen this in France recently. We are also seeing it in Britain very strongly. Dealing with these questions, to me, is very much part of peace education. I also would hope that peace education develops people into being more thoughtful or critical. I do not mean critical in a negative sense. But being able to look below the surface of questions, being able to see that there are many sides to a problem, is also part of the process of peace education.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

JC: Well, I think that with younger students there are a lot of the issues that I would not want to raise, at least not in any formal way. With younger students I would want to place the emphasis on developing positive concepts, on developing cooperative attitudes and developing the attitudes. But I would want those attitudes to continue and develop throughout the school. I want certainly to have the same sort of things that one might hope would start in pre-school, develop right through to the upper years of the secondary school. But with the older students, I would very much want to

introduce the major controversial issues that I think that I would not with younger students. When I have spoken to groups of parents and others about peace education, they say: Oh, with my nine-year-old, it would worry him to talk about nuclear questions. I think, well, that is a matter of balance, that is a matter of your judgement. But I think that those probably are questions that I would leave to later (unless these young students bring them up themselves).

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

JC: Within the social sciences which I have been involved with, I would want to raise the important questions of peace and questions of nuclear war. I am very influenced here by the work of Robert Lifton and his notion of "nuclear numbing": the fact that we do not really deal with these questions because we think that they are too big for us to deal with and we become, as he says, numb. I think that it is important for young people to come to terms with and to be able to discuss that. There seems to me that there is a lot of evidence around the world related to this. A Masters student in our university did a major international literature study for his thesis on adolescence and the nuclear question. He found that in all the literature from around the world (Russia, the United States, Sweden, etc.) young people, at the age of the upper secondary school, were very concerned about living in the nuclear age. There were some differences in their attitudes: there was a great deal of negative feelings within the United States, for example, while New Zealand students at that age were more positive about the future. But a common theme was that the adults, parents and teachers, did not talk enough with the adolescents about these issues. So that is something that I would want to bring in, probably within the social sciences, but also within the sciences. Within literature there are a lot of opportunities to raise peace topics and as I said right in the beginning, I have a strong interest in the connection of the arts with peace.

8

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have

any comments and preferences as to this terminology?
JC: I like the term "peace education", because, as I indicated before, it introduces the attitudes and ways of proceeding that I think are important. "Disarmament education" I have a little bit of difficulty with in that I feel it might give rise to those criticisms of peace education that say that this is pushing forward a particular political view – it is going to indoctrinate people. This kind of criticism has been common within New Zealand, Australia, and Britain, for example and I think that a term like disarmament education might be somewhat too explicit in a sense. I find the term "education for international understanding" a little bit vague; we have for a long while had that aim in New Zealand within our social studies programme, but I do not know that it moves over into action. I do very much like the term "global education". I like "global education" because it entails the interconnectedness of human beings with the environment and the interconnectedness of human beings and human cultures with each other. It introduces a wider context than simple international understanding. "Global education" makes clear to me the relationship with peace education, environmental education, education for justice and antiracist education. So of the terms that you have mentioned, I prefer the terms "peace education" or "education for peace" and "global education".

9.
ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?
JC: They *are* controversial, but to me an education that does not deal with important controversial issues, as I said before, is deficient. An educated person, I think, must be able to think about and deal with these controversial questions. Within New Zealand, the notion of dealing with controversial questions, particularly within the social sciences or social studies within schools, is well recognized, but perhaps not done as much in schools as it should be. There is no question, though, that many teachers I have spoken to are very concerned about the opposition from parents and from other members of the community. In 1987 in New Zealand, when we had a general election, the controversial questions of peace and nuclear questions became part of the election debate, and there were groups – such as a group called The Coalition for Concerned Citizens – which distributed

anti-peace-education literature.

I think that parents ought to be assured that their children are not going to be indoctrinated into some kind of political doctrine. Indoctrination, of course, would be the opposite of peace education anyway. Parents need to be assured that you are not going to bring a particular point of view across to the students. I found that this in Britain is a very important question, where peace education became very much linked with unilateral nuclear disarmament at least in the minds of many people and with opposition to British involvement in NATO. Peace education was simply seen as a kind of branch of the campaign for nuclear disarmament rather than helping people to think.

I would want to make a distinction between peace education, which is concerned with developing critical thought, and the very proper activities of the peace movement. A peace movement has a particular line to get across and the peace activists can use any methods they like to get it across. As someone who has been involved very much in the peace movements over the years, I have been involved in that sort of exercise. I think that is fine, but that is not an educational attitude. An educational attitude is to help young people to think clearly and deeply about the issues and I would want to assure parents that if you are engaged in peace education in the school, that you will not simply put across one particular view and expect all your students to accept that. That to me is somehow the opposite of peace education.

The way out of the problem I think is that you must always work in collaboration with the parents, and you must always be honest about what you are doing and try to bring parents as much as possible into the debate, tell them what you are doing. Parents should have the opportunity to express their views, and you should bring them as much as possible into the process.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

JC: I think we have to deal specifically with peace education in our teachers colleges in the teacher training. It is certainly not done very much at present in New Zealand, apart from where you have a particular lecturer in a teachers college who has an interest in this area related to social studies or health. In our teachers college in Wellington, for example, there are a number of people who are interested in peace education (some of them have

done my course), and who would within their work, say in social studies, health or literature, show the students how these subjects may be used for peace education.

Secondly, I think students must be helped to become more critical about the issues. I would want to see our teacher colleges turn out teachers who are thoughtful, concerned people.

Thirdly, I think that we need to address quite specifically teaching methods that emphasize democratic procedures, cooperative procedures, and methods of peaceful conflict resolutions, so that our teachers not only have the attitudes and understandings, but also the skills and the confidence to be able to operate with them.

ÅB: On these three points that you have mentioned, how would you say that teacher education in your country stands today?

JC: I think that it is difficult to say, because it to a large extent depends upon individual people within the schools. I think within teacher education there is a great deal of emphasis now upon helping people to work in democratic and cooperative ways, and certainly that is done within the colleges themselves, at least in the colleges that I know – particularly Wellington college, where there will be a lot that is done in terms of interpersonal relationship, rather than dealing with nuclear questions and global questions. But I think that if you asked people in all the teachers colleges what has been done in peace education, they may well say not very much. I think a lot of it may well be done incidently ăs part of the operation of the colleges, but I do not think you would find many courses lately on peace education within our teachers' program.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

JC: We have a lot of schools with a variety of nationalities. There are two questions here in New Zealand. The most important one is what we might call a bi-cultural question between the native Maori people and the rest of the New Zealand population. Secondly, there are a variety of other people from other parts of the world. It would be in many schools very common to have a very high percentage of children from the Pacific Islands (Samoa, Cook Islands etc.) and increasingly people from Indo-China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia. Many of our schools have a wide variety of nationalities.

Education for peace has to be engaged with questions of race and racism and has to be concerned to try to counteract any kind of racism within the schools. Unfortunately, there is, in many of our schools, quite a degree of racism. I think those questions have to be tackled as part of peace education.

The difficulties, I think, are the difficulties of attitude among many of the students. In some schools there may well be resistance on the part of some of the students, particularly with European ancestry, to study the lives of other students, but it is a very difficult question, because it depends so much on the particular kind of school. I think personally that the school which would have the least possibility of doing education for peace are those schools which are predominantly white. They lack the experience of dealing within the school with children from other nationalities, other ethnic backgrounds and other cultures.

A good school – we have many fine schools which are very multi-cultural in many ways – can do peace education through its multi-cultural activities and through its experience of the children at that school, at least bringing about better understanding. So I think that in many ways students representing a variety of nationalities could and should be a positive resource for peace education.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

JC: I think the two are so interrelated that it is necessary to deal with these problems together. I would want, though, and this to some extent I suppose reflects the experience of New Zealand, to widen the question of nuclear war towards nuclear power. New Zealand is nuclear free and that means free from nuclear power as well as nuclear weapons. There is no debate at all about nuclear weapons: American ships which carry nuclear weapons would not be allowed in New Zealand. But do we allow ships which are nuclear powered? That is in many ways the big debate now and I think that is an important question for us to look at. There is no nuclear power in New Zealand. There is tremendous opposition to develop nuclear power. But one of the problems is of course that most alternatives are *also* harmful. The majority of New Zealand's power, for example, is hydro-

electric and comes from our rivers and that has enormous environmental effects on our rivers. It also raises cultural questions for many of the Maori people, since the rivers have been not only an important source of food, but also an important context for cultural life.

So I think that for New Zealand it is not just a question of nuclear war but also the question of nuclear power. Another environmental question, which is also a matter of debate, is how much of our native timber resources, unique to New Zealand, should be exploited commercially. This is, of course, part of a world wide problem of the destruction of forests. There are a number of questions like this in New Zealand as there are in most countries; protection of our native bird life, for example, which New Zealand has quite a good record on, but the financial resources for our Department of Conservation to do this work are limited. These are very important matters of debate and I think they should be dealt with in education.

13

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

JC: There is one other approach to peace education that has been very influential, and I should have mentioned it earlier, that of Paulo Freire. My students study his approaches and have worked quite a lot with them. I like very much Freire's notion of generative themes, which are very useful when you are talking about dealing with controversial issues. You take a theme, such as nuclear war and nuclear power, and then move off into all sorts of other subjects and all sorts of other developments. A theme should be rich in possibilities. That is something that many of my students take on as a kind of mode of curriculum organization. I think that in many ways Paulo Freire is one of the crucial figures in peace education.

The other person whom of course we study, at least to some extent, is Johan Galtung and particularly here the notion of structural violence. I particularly like his newer concept of cultural violence, which has, I think, very important significance for New Zealand in its search for a truly bi-cultural and multi-cultural society.

HENK B. GERRITSMA & DAAN VERBAAN (THE NETHERLANDS)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

HG: I was born in 1937. From 1954 to 1962 I studied geography and history at the University of Groningen. Next I was a teacher (1962 to 1975) at a secondary school, age level 12-18, where I taught geography. Since 1974 I have been a staff member of the Institute for Peace Research (the Polemological Institute) at the University of Groningen. I belong to the section Peace Education/Education on Global Conflicts and Problems; at present I am Head of this section.

My interest in this field dates from the end of the sixties. It was influenced by the foundation of the Dutch Interchurch Peace Council (IKV) in 1967, through which public interest in the East-West conflict, in the problem of the nuclear arms race, and in the problem of underdevelopment increased strongly. Another influence was the Vietnam movement from the same period. I participated in both movements from the beginning. As a consequence, I paid attention to those conflicts and problems in my lessons.

In the same period I became involved in a peace education project at the Polemological Institute. In 1974 I was appointed a co-worker in that project, and in 1975 a staff member for peace education at the Institute. In the same year I was appointed a member of the board of the Interchurch Peace Council, with the special assignment of promoting information on problems of war and peace (both to the general public and within secondary education).

DV: I was born in 1963 in Amsterdam. In 1982 I started studying history at the University of Groningen. From the beginning of the eighties I have been engaged in the peace movement, especially the Interchurch Peace Council. These were the times of an intensive debate in the Netherlands around the deployment of cruise missiles. In my studies I took some courses on peace-and-war questions: first a course on the images of peace and war in European countries from the 16th till the 20th century; later on two courses on peace research and peace education.

In 1986 I started my work at the Polemological Institute as an assistant researcher to Mr Henk Gerritsma, one of the staff members here. In 1988 I refused military service and so I continued my job at the institute.

ÅB: Could you tell me a little about this institute and especially its section

for peace education?

HG: The Polemological Institute was founded in 1962 and was the first of its kind in the Netherlands: a peace research institute with a multi-disciplinary approach. Peace education has been a special field of attention in the program of the Institute since the end of the sixties. Since the beginning of the seventies, the Polemological Institute has had a Department for Peace Education with the general objective of promoting peace education, especially at the secondary level (age 12-18). Since 1974, usually about six persons have been involved in these activities, including two regular staff members.

The Peace Education Department tries to realize its objective by means of (a) research, (b) development of teaching materials, (c) curriculum development, and (d) various efforts to implement peace-related instruction in regular education.

With regard to research, we distinguish between development research and general research. Looking back upon the twenty years, the emphasis has been on development research. However, since the mid-eighties the emphasis has been shifting to general research. Most of the work is carried out in the form of comprehensive, several-year projects.

ÅB: Could you describe briefly one of these projects as an example of the type of work carried out?

HG: From 1977 to 1987 we carried out a project aimed at the introduction and adoption of global education in schools, in cooperation with the Centre for Peace Research at the University of Nijmegen. Using a Dutch abbreviation, we called it the INVRO project.

The emphasis was on how to promote the adoption of global education in secondary education - by the educational authorities and in the existing school subjects. The work included the development of teaching materials as well as the development of concepts and approaches attuned to and useful for secondary education. Different forms of teacher training and teacher support were also part of our activities. Our institute published seven case studies (including teacher manuals), three handbooks and several other reports from this project. (For example, you could find more information in a report I published with C.H.M. Barthelds for Unesco in 1984: "Peace Education in the Netherlands: Report on a project".)

ÅB: Daan, could you give some examples of the particular work you have been involved in here?

DV: In 1988 I travelled through West Germany and Great Britain to make an inventory of different views of peace education in those countries. – In

1989 I started working on a special project on how to include peace-related themes in different school subjects. – In 1990 I got involved in the Institute's cooperation project with the Pedagogical Institute in Murmansk (USSR), dealing with East-West and especially Soviet-Dutch relations.

As a historian, my opinion is that you have to know the past, for otherwise you cannot act in a responsible way. My interest is in the background of present developments in our society. Peace and war is one problem area that we have to be able to handle; otherwise we will not survive in the end.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

DV: In general, peace education is education about international problems which form a threat to our world. In the tradition of the peace-education department in Groningen we work in three main problem areas: the under-development of the Third World, the pollution of our environment, and war and conflicts between and within states.

In a more narrow definition, peace education is focused on the problem of peace and war between and within states. Peace education wants to make a clear analysis of those conflicts and it tries to stress the possibilities of a peaceful solution of conflicts. Therefore it stresses peace initiatives and tries to put the problems in as hopeful a perspective as possible.

In both definitions, peace education is political education in the sense that it tries to teach children how to handle such problems; that is, how to form their opinions about these problems and how to work on a solution.

HG: I conceive peace education in the first place as peace learning and peace studies: as education in global conflicts and problems, aimed at awareness and knowledge of and insight into these conflicts and problems, and the need for and possibility of political change. Peace education is conceived especially as problem-oriented political education, with the emphasis on transferring knowledge of and insight into the backgrounds, causes and characters of the global conflicts and problems which threaten peace, as well as on possibilities and proposals for peaceful conflict regulation and resolution, and for limiting and solving problems. As a consequence, the emphasis should be on the development of teaching materials and curricula, based on theories, knowledge and insights from conflict and peace research and related scientific disciplines. In the Netherlands we call this approach "direct" or "explicit" peace education.

There is another approach which we call "indirect" or "implicit" peace education. It is characteristic for that approach that peace education is conceived especially as teaching values related to peace. The difference from the first approach is that implicit peace education has a more general and less political character. The emphasis is on moral education, with peace as a central value. Education should promote peace in thought, attitudes and conduct. As a consequence, peace education is conceived as education for peace, through a pedagogical/educational 'climate' which is determined by peace as a central value. The criticism of this approach was, and is, that peace is used too exclusively as a pedagogical concept, and not at all, or too little, as a political concept; and that, thereby, peace education remains too general, not enough concerned with the concrete geo-political conflicts and problems.

Both approaches are necessary and essential. But, in my opinion, peace education should primarily be explicit peace learning (and, on a higher level, peace studies). Otherwise, there is the risk of restricting it to a general, especially pedagogical/educational concept/principle.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

HG: My own schooldays (primary and secondary level) were dominated by the end of World War II and the period of the origin of the East-West conflict and the rise of the Cold War. When I think back, there was not anything which I would specifically call peace education. On the contrary, because I grew up in a sphere of admiration for military power, by which we were liberated from German domination, and which, at the end of the forties, was seen as necessary to prevent a new domination (the Soviet/communist threat). I grew up in a time in which peace through strength, a strong military power, was a matter of course, and in which the Cold War/nuclear deterrence policy was not yet questioned.

If I look for some form of peace education, I can only refer to my religious education, in which biblical standards and values were strongly emphasized. I would call it a moral-ethical education. But it was not connected with political reality in the sense that foreign policy was discussed. My church supported and justified that policy completely, and so did I. There was a dilemma, but the choice was clear and explicit in spite of moral-ethical questions. But the sensitivity to standards and values from this moral education may have indirectly influenced my involvement in the

peace movement since the sixties (in the broad sense) and, as a consequence, my changed political orientation.

DV: In my secondary-school days, there were several teachers who laid stress on the possibilities of participation in the political process. Especially my history teacher and geography teachers paid attention to the problems of war, peace and the underdevelopment of the Third World.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

DV: This varies with the sort of school and the motivation of individual teachers to pay attention to these problems. I think that today there are many teachers in the Netherlands who do pay attention to the problems of peace, war, underdevelopment of the Third World and the environmental pollution. In most of the school subjects, teachers have the possibility to pay attention to these world problems. Some themes of the problem of underdevelopment of the Third World have been integrated into the school curricula. There is government support for education about problems of (under)development of the Third World. Today there is specific interest in the schools in environmental problems. From the governmental side there is also much support for integrating these environmental themes into the school subjects. Less attention is paid to armament/disarmament questions in relation to the East-West conflict. There is still interest in these questions in relation to other conflicts in the world (the Gulf War, for example). You could say, regarding education about the problem of war and peace, that there is a constant mainstream of teachers who pay attention to these problems.

For example, I work with two secondary-school teachers of economics who have dealt with the problems of economic conversion for several years. Each year they give a course of ten lessons to pupils in the higher classes of secondary school. This project started as an introductory course on the connection between the economy and armament. Later on the project developed into an established examination course for the sixth form pupils. After another year of international political changes, the result is a new course about the problems and perspectives of conversion from military production to civil production in our society.

A second example is a teacher packet on chemical weapons. A secondary-school chemistry teacher in Groningen has been working on this subject since the end of the seventies. The problem of chemical weapons is quite an

unusual subject in regular school chemistry. In a teacher packet called: "Chemical weapons, how long will we accept them?", the author tries to make it clear that chemistry teachers have the responsibility to inform pupils about the history and the chemical aspects of those weapons.

HG: I am convinced that schools in the Netherlands contribute to indirect/implicit as well to direct/explicit peace education. When I say this, I know that it is too absolute and optimistic. It is more correct to say that I am convinced that schools have good opportunities to contribute to some form of peace education, and that many schools do so.

This conviction is based on developments during the last twenty years. The circumstances for peace education have become more favourable since the end of the sixties. *One reason* is the changing political climate; due to the influence of the media and the activity of several institutions, groups and movements (especially the peace movement IKV), there is increasing public attention to and interest in international political conflicts and problems, and in foreign policy. That is true also for teachers and pupils/students. This has been expressed in an increasing demand from teachers and schools for information, teaching materials and teacher training concerning those conflicts and problems. In connection with this, another development has been important: a continuous process of educational reform, and the introduction of social science as a new school subject.

Another major reason is that peace education has been stimulated by the development of teaching materials and curricula concerning international conflicts and problems. During the seventies, the impulses came especially from peace research institutes, from other institutes/institutions/foundations aimed at promoting peace, and from the peace movement. Since the end of the seventies, the impulses have also increasingly come from inside schools, from teachers' organizations, and from textbook publishers. In connection with the development of teaching materials and curricula, teacher training has been stimulated. This may be discerned in programs and courses from institutes for teacher training (for different age levels).

As a result of these developments, schools have the opportunity to pay explicit and systematic attention to peace education conceived as education on political conflicts and problems which threaten peace. Since the mid-eighties, development education and environmental education have been recognized as subjects to be included in Dutch education. With government support, the development of teaching materials and curricula has been, and is, stimulated, as is teacher training. This recognition has not

included peace education conceived as education on the problems of war, armament and negative peace, however. The Dutch government is still cautious about that issue. This means that there is currently hardly any governmental support in this area, and that there are no initiatives for coordinating the development of teaching materials and curricula. To a large extent this remains dependent on private initiatives.

Schools have the opportunity to contribute to peace education, and many schools have done so and are still doing it. On the one hand, many schools have participated intensively in different development projects ever since the beginning of the seventies, and have used the teaching materials of these projects. On the other hand, many teachers and schools use, or are willing to use, the teaching materials which have been developed.

There are, however, various restrictions. One restriction is the problem of time-tabling, because there are many 'new' subjects/fields of attention, but no or little 'room' for addressing issues systematically. Another restriction is that teaching materials must link up with the programs of existing subjects/disciplines, because many teachers argue that, because of problems of time-tabling, peace education issues should be tackled through the traditional disciplines. One problem is that the peace education teaching materials are still insufficiently attuned to the different disciplines, because the emphasis is on political conflicts and problems (peace education as problem-oriented education). As a consequence, publications are now being prepared which deal with the possibilities of various school subjects/ disciplines for peace education themes. A third restriction is that the interest in political conflicts and problems as part of peace education is strongly conditioned by current political events and developments. It is very difficult to meet the request for up-to-date teaching material in such instances. We have tried to solve this problem through a magazine for teachers, published every three months. After three years we were forced, however, to terminate that project.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

DV: Schools can contribute to peace education in different ways. First you have to find teachers who are willing to teach their pupils about international problems. Several teachers can develop a project together. The development of education materials can be helpful to teachers who

want to set up a project in their school. Another possibility to assist teachers is to organize specific teacher-training courses around these subjects.

One strategy outside school is trying to influence methods and curricula on the level of educational planning. Therefore, it can be useful to take part in curricula-development commissions, trying to put subjects related to international problems into the school curricula.

HG: I think, as appears from my previous answer, that it is possible for schools to contribute to peace education. In the same answer I referred indirectly to some conditions. Those conditions are: a) Availability of teaching materials, which have been developed in cooperation with teachers/schools, and which are attuned to distinct age groups, existing subjects and curricula, and to the time-table. b) Availability of teachers' manuals, with instructions about the use of those materials. c) Availability of a curriculum, based on experiences gained in school practice. d) Supply of courses for teacher training and of other possibilities to support teachers with regard to political conflicts and problems. e) Recognition of, or at least consent to, peace education projects from educational authorities.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

DV: In my opinion, peace education differs for older and younger students as to the level of handling the problems. You can't expect the same degree of abstraction from younger pupils in relation to these problems. Therefore, I make the distinction between micro-level and macro-level approaches.

At the primary-school level, pupils should learn how to manage conflicts in their own environment. In this period of their life they should learn such values as solidarity, honesty etc. At the secondary-school level, pupils should learn more about international problems and the possibilities to solve them.

HG: With regard to possible differences in approaches to peace education among younger and older pupils, I want to say first that, compared with the existing school subjects, peace education does not have an exceptional position. We have to deal with the same differences which apply to those school subjects, in the sense that the build-up of the curricula is qualified by and attuned to the age level. The same pedagogic and didactic 'rules' are valid. As a consequence, the same general build-up applies: from a first introduction to international conflicts and problems to a more thorough

analysis.

For peace education, however, there has been a tendency to make an exception, in the sense that education on those conflicts and problems has been considered unsuitable for younger pupils because of the danger of 'doomsday thinking' and feelings of helplessness; and because it should be unwarranted to confront children with threatening political questions. Of course, this anxiety is not wrong. But on the other hand, we have to deal with the actual situation that children hear and read in the news. In our country there is a special TV news-reel for them, and newspapers have youth-oriented sections. This means that children are confronted daily with what's going on in the world, and that they have questions and pose them. In my opinion, this cannot be neglected in education. And my experience with teaching materials for younger pupils (not only on secondary level), convinces me that it *is* possible to deal with such questions. It is clear that the age level should be considered, but that is a pedagogic-didactic problem which can be solved.

It is necessary to make some additional remarks with regard to the answer that peace education is no exception in comparison with existing school subjects. This answer is too easy, because the situation of peace education is of a different kind. Peace education is, for instance, not a specific subject. This *either* means that peace education maintains the character of being complementary to the existing school program, but apart from the traditional subjects; the situation that schools pay occasional attention to peace education in a joint project. *Or* it means that peace education should be integrated in the existing subjects. If that's the position, it is of importance that the contents and programs of these subjects are broadened on the basis of the content and objectives of peace education. One precondition is the availability of an elaborated concept of peace education and a longitudinal curriculum. Another condition is that this program is clearly attuned to the existing subjects. The Peace Education section of the Polemological Institute has pursued this kind of integration. This strategy has met with response and is expressed in the process of curriculum development and in changing the contents of textbooks.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

DV: As a history teacher I would try to give the pupils a better understanding of the causes of war. I want to stress that war is always based on human decisions and not an accident that cannot be prevented. In that case you could also say that there were always people in history who made proposals for a peaceful resolution of conflicts. History should make pupils aware of different opinions, also in the past, with regard to the solutions of conflicts.

HG: When I was a school teacher (of geography), I made use of the possibilities of dealing with political conflicts and problems. The geography curriculum offered plenty of opportunities for that, especially with regard to the issue of underdevelopment and development and, in this connection, the question of direct and structural violence. I paid attention to those issues, both generally and more specifically, that is illustrated them with cases - at that time wars connected with the process of decolonization, for instance in Angola and the Sudan; the Middle East conflict; expressions of violence in Latin America; and the Vietnam war.

If I were a secondary-level teacher now, I would use the teaching materials which have been developed at the Polemological Institute. As a geography teacher I would use especially the materials which deal with the North-South issue. With regard to the question of how I would try to make pupils more conscious of and prepared for this issue, I refer briefly to the ideas which underlie those materials. When developing the materials, we used a number of key concepts, formulated in the following questions: a) Which are the parties in the conflict/problem? b) What are their interests? c) What is their power, and to what extent are they using it? d) What are the roots of the conflict/problem? e) What is our/the Dutch involvement? f) Which values/human rights are at issue? These concepts/questions were elaborated in a model of a case study, which can be rendered schematically as follows. 1) Introduction; 2) Description of the conflict/problem, including (historical) backgrounds, parties and their claims, and the Dutch involvement; 3) Parties directly involved; 4) Analysis of the conflict/problem and interpretations; 5) Possible solutions; 6) Dutch involvement – opinions.

We also had a model for the learning process: a didactic method, elaborated in a teachers' manual. The stages of this model were: 1) Introduction/motivation; 2) Exploration/analysis; 3) Learning to opt for solutions; 4) Presentation; 5) Evaluation.

The models were not prescribed as compelling and obligatory, but conceived as guidelines for both the authors and the users of the materials.

They are useful instruments for achieving perspective.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

DV: I prefer the term *education for international understanding*, and then I include all the problems of interstate and innerstate conflicts, the problems of underdevelopment of the Third World, and the problem of environmental pollution. Education for international understanding should work for better cooperation in order to solve these problems.

The term *disarmament education* focuses too much on the problems of armament and disarmament. This is only one of the international problems.

Peace education is a term which causes many misunderstandings. You have to make your definition of peace clear, before you start working with it. The word peace has been misused in many different ways.

HG: In my experience and opinion as well, peace education is a confusing term. In our Institute we try to avoid this term. Instead we have used the term "global education", and currently we are speaking of "education (conceived as learning) on international conflicts and problems" – subdivided into questions of war, armament and peace, of underdevelopment and development, and of environmental pollution and protection.

I do believe in a possibility to contribute, by means of education (especially conceived as learning), to more knowledge and insight, and to the awareness that, with regard to threatening conflicts and problems, different positions and choices are possible - that values play a prominent part when one has to decide on a position and an attitude. In that sense, awareness of values represented in the UN Charter and Declarations is essential; those values should be emphasized in education.

From our viewpoint and conception, education should contribute to 'international understanding and cooperation' and, as a consequence, to an 'international or global orientation'. As for the term 'disarmament education', I am very doubtful. Instead we use the term education (learning) on the problems of armament, arms control and disarmament as a part of education (learning) on questions of war and peace.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

DV: I don't believe that you should introduce peace education in school as a subject. It is more important to implement different themes of the peace and war problems in different school subjects. For example, the problem of chemical weapons can be well attuned to school chemistry.

You could say that debating peace and war problems has always been a controversial issue. Therefore you have to prepare your lessons well before you start a project about these problems. First you have to be sure that your information is clear and that there is room for different opinions. Sometimes parents are very anxious about indoctrination. Accusations of indoctrination have to be taken seriously, that is, teachers have to be open to discussions.

HG: Education on political conflicts and problems is controversial in different ways. First of all until the mid-eighties, peace education was confronted with mistrust of its objectives; especially with regard to themes like security policy. This was inspired by the fear of partiality, one-sided information and hidden objectives. It had to do with fixed political opinions, and it was also related to the predominant view that education should be neutral. We have responded to this problem in several ways: a) By explaining very clearly our concept as well as our objectives of peace education. b) By elaborating the teaching materials in cooperation with teachers/schools; those materials were first reviewed by the educational authorities and tested in a number of schools, and only then were they published and distributed. c) By providing well-balanced and comprehensive information, and by presenting different opinions and interpretations. d) By creating conditions, by means of a didactic method, for an open process of opinion formation, with the emphasis on the pupils' own reasoned choices. We did not say that peace education is neutral, because it is biased, like the teaching of all social subjects.

Other criticism is related to the fear that pupils will feel helpless and pessimistic if confronted with threatening political conflicts and problems. The question is raised whether it is pedagogically justifiable to deal with these conflicts and problems in the classroom. We have taken these apprehensions into account by emphasizing (a) clarifying analysis, and not

terrifying information, (b) the possibilities of and proposals for peaceful control, conflict resolution and reduction, and the attempts made to realize these.

Another difficulty in this connection has been the limited interest and involvement of adolescents in politics. We have taken this into account: a) by attempting to translate these problems into the world of the pupils as much as possible, in close cooperation with teachers. b) by emphasizing a pupil-directed didactic method, which appeals to their personal activity and involvement.

In our work we have been confronted with *two other restrictions*. On the one hand, there is the problem that an adequate handling of political conflicts and problems places high demands upon teachers. Experience has proved that they need substantial didactic training and support, especially because these issues received relatively little attention in teacher training until the late seventies. On the other hand, there is little or no room for peace education as a new subject, and the possibilities of the curricula of the school subjects to deal with questions of political conflicts and problems are limited. Hence, peace education should not be propagated as a new subject, but the objectives should be integrated in the existing curricula and textbooks.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

DV: Teacher-training courses can be orientated towards subjects such as underdevelopment, peace and war problems and environmental pollution. It is important to stimulate teacher-training institutes to pay more attention to these problems, both in their own education programs and in their in-service training courses for teachers. Such teacher-training courses could be one of the conditions for a better implementation of specific themes in school.

HG: We have paid much attention to teacher training. Firstly, we have done research into the questions and needs of teachers with regard to education on political conflicts and problems. On the basis of that research, we have developed, in addition to teaching materials, publications with background information for teachers. Besides, we have organized courses for teachers who participated in our projects, as much as possible in co-operation with the existing institutes for teacher training; not only on the contents of peace education, but also on the didactics.

Secondly, we have paid much attention to publishing the experiences which we acquired from our school-directed projects; not only in books, but also in many articles in teachers' magazines. It's worth noting that, among others, we have published a handbook on Peace Education in School Subjects, and that a new handbook on that theme is being prepared.

Thirdly, we have organized regular teachers' conferences on peace education, to discuss and evaluate the projects and teaching materials. As to teacher training, our strategy has been directed to the integration of peace education into the programs of teacher-training institutes; both with regard to the education of students and to refresher courses for teachers.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

DV: Cultural diversity in a classroom should be a stimulus for pupils and make them aware of other life styles and cultures. This is important in learning the different values which I mentioned earlier.

HG: It is difficult to answer the question whether and to what extent it would be possible to use the mixed 'population' of the schools – in the sense of a growing variety of nationalities – as a resource in peace education, because we have little experience of that issue. The only thing I can say about that is that in our project on development education in vocational training, we try to make use of this fact. As to the problem of underdevelopment, the situation of a mixed school population can contribute to more 'recognition' and, as a consequence, to more involvement.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

DV: In the classroom you have to educate pupils in a responsible way, which means that international problems should not make pupils afraid. It is important that you give pupils a sort of future vision, including questions like: What could be done to solve the problems, and how can pupils

contribute to that?

HG: When the Polemological Institute took the initiative, at the beginning of the seventies, to develop a peace education program for secondary education, the emphasis was on the East-West conflict and the problem of nuclear armament as well as on the adversary relations between North and South and associated problems. During the second phase, i.e. since the end of the seventies, the interrelation between these issues has been emphasized. This was expressed in our development of case studies, for instance in a study on the theme Hunger for Weapons. In addition, it was expressed in the introduction of the term *global education*. During that period the scope of the project was expanded to include the problem of environmental pollution, which resulted in the development of teaching materials and a curriculum on that issue. The term *global education* has been chosen to express both the broad scope and the interrelation of peace-related questions.

This interrelation has not only been the point of departure of our projects, but also of the official, government-sponsored projects on curriculum development. Environmental education has been promoted officially by the Dutch government since the mid-eighties. Our Institute is one of the participants in that project owing to our experience of problem-oriented education and, in that context, of the issue of environmental pollution. As a consequence, our concept of and approach to education on threatening international conflicts and problems have influenced the approach to environmental education in this country.

PETRA HESSE (USA)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

PH: I think most recently I became interested in peace education because I have been teaching at a college that trains teachers, and I know that many teachers are very much concerned about conflicts and conflict resolution in their classrooms. I teach courses on political, social and emotional development. Somehow I think the content of the courses I teach and the concern of my students converge in my interest in children's social development, conflict resolution, and political development.

In America, many teachers are particularly interested in conflict resolution in their classrooms because of the deregulation of children's television in the early 1980s, which has led to a situation where there are no clear limits any more on the amount of violence that can be shown on this television.The incidents of violence have increased on many children's TV programs, and as a result teachers see a lot more war games in their classrooms. It's almost a socio-cultural phenomenon. When there is an increase in violence in the classrooms, teachers really feel a need to do something about it.

In terms of my more longstanding interest, the fact that I grew up in Germany, I think, means that I have carried with me a certain amount of guilt about the Holocaust. So there is a sort of long-standing interest in the prevention of war, in how to prevent stereotyping that easily leads to violence, eventually to the kind of violence that occurred during the Holocaust. So I think there has been some kind of sensitization that has been with me for a long period of time.

ÅB: How long were you in Germany?

PH: I lived in Germany for the first 22 years of my life, so I went through elementary and high school and three years of college there before I came to the States.

ÅB: Could you also tell me something about your present work?

PH: Currently I am an assistant professor of human development. At a very small college in Boston I am teaching courses not just of human development, but also on social psychology and clinical psychology. It's a teachers' training college. Then I am also a research associate at the Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age, which was founded a few years ago out of a concern about children's fears of the future and children's

concerns about nuclear war.

To summarize the nature of my research work, I coordinate a research project on children's and adolescents' images of the enemy and have more recently become more interested in an integration of media literacy, multi-cultural and conflict resolution education. My work on children's television is a spin-off of my research on children's images of the enemy. I became interested in the images of the enemy on children's television, because many children told me that they get their ideas about good guys and bad guys from children's television.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

PH: Well, it's biased by what my own work is about, so I think first of classrooms with small children, primarily kindergarten and elementary schools and our own work on peace education. I think of multi-cultural education, making children appreciate the differences in customs, habits, language – the physical differences in cultures as well as the more subtle emotional and social differences.

My own research indicates that children are wary of people who look different, people who are strangers, people who somehow speak differently, look differently or have slightly different habits. So when I think of peace education, ideally I think of completely multi-cultural classrooms, where children representing different races and different cultures are combined, but whether that's possible depends very much on where you conduct your peace education. I also think of peace education as a training of children in empathy with people who are different. So basically I believe that peace education should consist of making sure that children can identify with people who might be different from them. I can see from my own research that young children have a tough time taking the perspective of others. Therefore, they should be encouraged and trained while still young to take the perspective of others. Then it also relates to my research on children's media in this country, where children are systematically taught that somebody who looks different is evil. That's a very common theme in children's cartoon shows. I want children to see the similarities between themselves and other people, they should feel for other people who are in pain.

And then I think of peace education as a training in conflict resolution skills that does acknowledge that children as well as adults are often in

conflict. The fact that human beings are often in conflict, and are often aggressive doesn't mean that their conflicts have to lead to violence. So what we have been encouraging is creative conflict resolution in the classroom, letting children brainstorm about alternatives to punching each other: What are some of the strategies that can be used? Can they always use words, or are there alternatives to using words? How do they come to some kind of agreement on or resolution of their conflicts that is short of violence but also doesn't ignore the conflict? I definitely don't believe in ignoring conflicts.

In the classroom we may let the children pledge their allegiance to the planet, encouraging children to empathize with other groups. But I also think that something has to happen to get children to have a relationship with nature, to have a relationship with people all over the world and also with the whole earth. Hence I think part of peace education should also be some form of environmental education. I would also encourage them to identify with other species, like animals and nature that is threatened by environmental destruction. I would encourage children at an early age to do things that they can do. I would like to empower even very young children to feel that they can make a difference in the world. Even five-year-olds can do a few things to contribute to cleaning up the environment, for example.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

PH: It's an interesting question. As far as I remember, I would say peace education started sometime in high school. That wasn't *called* peace education, but typically happened as part of our social studies or history lessons. I remember a couple of teachers, very young teachers, who I think were concerned about the Holocaust, who systematically exposed us children to Nazi Germany and what happened to the Jews during Nazi Germany, showed us films of concentration camps etc.

I don't have a sense of it as being something that was school-wide and that was really institutionalized and was part of the mandated curriculum. Rather, it was something that individual teachers took upon themselves. I definitely remember one social studies teacher who (in the 8th or 9th grade) actually did a lot of things with us. He went to factories with us, he really made some attempts to do a social class analysis of Germany, to educate us about environmental issues at the time, to get us to explore what

our goals in the world were etc.

ÅB: What year would this be?

PH: I was born in 1955, so that would have been in the late 60s, early 70s. Those teachers were young teachers trying to implement some of their ideals in their own classrooms, and it's interesting because it's different from how I define peace education. Those teachers had a commitment to educating us about Germany's past, to making us politically active and socially responsible. One particular teacher (I think he taught me when I was 14) actually read some sort of peace research writings with us, including a Galtung-type sociological analysis. They were very much concerned about the third world and structural injustices.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

PH: It's hard to tell, because I think in the United States it really differs from state to state. But there is definitely a trend towards more and more interest in peace education, especially among younger teachers and in part for the reasons I mentioned initially. I think there are a lot of teachers in this country who have become very much concerned about inner city violence. Teachers who teach in inner cities are very much concerned about gang violence, and, as I said earlier, about violence that seems to be in part promoted by the media, violence that children seem to copy from the media. The frustration of city poverty has also contributed to the gang violence. A lot of teachers have begun to feel that they have to do something about it, and, I think, because of that are really struggling to implement more peace education in their classrooms.

But I'm also aware of an institutionalization of peace education. I know that a bunch of groups have come into being during the last 10 or 15 years. A prominent one is Educators for Social Responsibility, who are organizing all over the country and who have peace education projects in schools all over the country and are training people to be peace educators. Basically they conduct workshops for teachers. I have no idea what percentage of schools actually have peace education projects, but I know that there are whole school systems now that have peace education in this sense as part of their curriculum.

ÅB: You started by talking about inner city violence as a motivating force, and about peace education as promoting non-violent problem solving within the classroom or within the city. Would you also say that the global aspects

of peace education are attended to, or do you think that they are dealt with to a lesser extent?

PH: I think that global aspects of peace education are dealt with to a lesser extent. But I think there is beginning to be more environmental education. I visit a lot of schools and have seen signs of environmental education everywhere, for example, at the front of science teachers' classrooms. I have a feeling that science teachers as well as literature and social studies teachers talk about environmental issues, and I think there is a greater global focus in this country as far as environmental education is concerned, whereas most peace education programs actually focus on resolving children's conflicts in the classroom. I feel that's where I and my co-worker Debby come in. Given that I grew up in Germany, I have a much more international perspective.

To me peace education should always educate, not just about other cultures in this country, but also about other world cultures. On children's television the enemy tends to be an Asian or a fascist with a German accent (there are still lots of Nazis on kids' television) and then there are Eastern Europeans and Arabs. We had lots of enemy Arabs on children's television long before the Gulf crisis started. So on children's television, foreigners from other cultures tend to be portrayed as the enemy. Because of that I believe that peace education should expose children to other countries, people in other countries, people who speak totally different languages.

I sometimes find that I'm more interested in nationalism and nationalistic issues, whereas I think people in the United States are much more concerned about racial tension. To me peace education should deal with *both* these aspects: racism and nationalism.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

PH: Yes, in terms of content I think it's definitely possible for schools to make room for peace education, and I don't see peace education as something that's simply added to children's curricula. I think that's important, and I think we have been working on a very integrated curriculum in our work. Issues of conflict and peace and conflict resolution turn up in all parts of the curriculum, so it's no longer just restricted to social studies, but you can talk about a conflict when you talk about math. You can use

simple classification tasks, asking children to bring in pictures of people from different countries. You can combine basic math instruction that occurs in elementary school, teaching children to add and subtract and things like that, with introducing children to other cultures. I really think this is possible throughout the curriculum: whether it's in music, and you sing songs about other cultures; or whether it's in literature, where you read stories from other cultures or show children and families from other cultures; or whether it's in art education, where you may show children art from different cultures.

ÅB: So you feel it's very possible to introduce peace education materials in various subjects and at various school levels. If you think of it in terms of outcome, has there been research related to the results of peace education?

PH: There are a lot of impressionistic accounts where people describe what a peace education program has achieved in their classrooms or in the school system. But I'm not personally aware of any more systematic evaluation research. And there are great difficulties in such work. Are you going to conduct questionnaires with kids and ask them about their attitudes? Then you meet with that old problem again: how do the attitudes translate into action, and is there a relationship between the two? Or do you measure results in terms of incidents of conflict and violence in the classroom?

ÅB: Such evaluation attempts have not been part of your own studies?

PH: No, but there's beginning to be more pressure on me to do that.

I've answered your main question in terms of content in the classroom. But there is also the more difficult issue of convincing school personnel. I think a lot of people, as I said, are motivated and really feel a need to have programs on peace education, but I find that it's still hard to get whole school systems to implement programs of peace education. Dedicated teachers who care about peace issues do implement programs in their own classrooms and maybe sometimes enlist some other teachers in their schools, but it may be very hard to actually implement peace education on a large scale, persuading a whole state, for example. At least in this country there is a lot of struggling around it.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

PH: In our research on enemy images we find that young children, 4 to 6 year olds, spontaneously think of a monster when you ask them to talk about enemies. So an enemy is one monster or sometimes one person who is

threatening, whereas 7-9 year-olds think of enemies as bullies in their school, with whom they have some kind of relationship of enmity.

Because of these findings I have begun to think that with younger children, that is children at the kindergarden age and maybe in the early elementary grades, one should perhaps restrict peace education to their individual, personal, very concrete conflicts in the classroom. I feel I haven't resolved this completely in my mind, but maybe with 5-year-olds and 7-year-olds it makes more sense to them if you help them deal with their own conflicts in the classroom. There they get into a fight with somebody – I hate you, I hate you – and this person is all mad and evil. Maybe it would be most useful to them if we actually helped them to see that perhaps the other person is angry at them too etc. So I think one could lay down some type of foundation of peace education in any grade that maybe isn't so international but focuses on peaceful management of the classroom and classroom conflicts.

Now, if you happen to have a multi-cultural classroom and kids from different racial groups, you may get a fair amount of very personal conflicts between groups in your classroom. So, in other words, you may have a black child fighting with a white child, and they may start yelling at each other: You nigger etc. If you have a multi-cultural classroom, I mean, that's the most elegant way of teaching children interpersonal conflict resolution skills that are already tied to teaching about other cultures and other groups, but through the interactions of specific individuals.

One thing we have done is that we have already immersed very young children in education about other cultures, but it's not quite clear how it's working. We travel around the world on the globe with young children. We expose children to flags of other countries, to pictures of people in other countries. But it's not quite clear how much of it they take in, it's not clear how much of it they understand, because there is some confusion for them about people inside of America and outside of America etc.

About the age of 10-11-12 it's different. We find in our research that that's the age when children begin to talk about conflicts between groups, begin to talk about war, begin to be curious about the origins of war. So somehow I believe that a real discussion of conflicts beyond the classroom that concern different nations maybe can begin in a really meaningful way only in late childhood. Then I would really talk about other nations, war and conflicts from a more historical perspective.

But that doesn't mean I wouldn't expose younger children, if they have questions about international conflicts. It's very confusing in a way, because

obviously many younger children became concerned about war when the Gulf war was going on. They had a lot of questions about what was going on, why the troops were there, how far away it was, whether they were going to be affected by the war, whether their parents were going to be safe and things like that. One should try to answer children's questions honestly. But I would have a bias not to overwhelm let's say 7-year-olds or 5-year-olds with details about war, about wars at different times of history and why we have wars and things like that.

ÅB: Are there some additional results from your research on the development of enemy images that you may tell me about?

PH: What we find is that 4-6 year-old children in different countries tend to think of the enemy as one person who is menacing and who tends to be all evil. Children tend to think that this person cannot be good. They tend to deny that they themselves have conflicts or that other people may see them as being enemies to them, so it's very hard for young children to accept that other people could sometimes think that they are bad or evil or that they are trying to be mean or something like that. So young children have a certain rigidity in their views about good and bad. Enemies are all bad, and they can't be good.

Slightly older children, 7-9 year-olds, tend to think of enemies as bullies in their school. These kids sometimes wait for them on their way home and try to beat them up and tease them and call them names. But children do begin to see that they have a relationship of enmity with these boys, in other words that the bullies might also see them as an enemy. There is much more mutuality, and they can actually take the perspective of the bully. At the same time I think it's interesting that children in this age group frequently don't know *why* other people think that they might be an enemy. They always blame the other person for the origin of the fight. He started it, it wasn't me. Or they say: Well, I accidentally punched this person. Their contribution to the conflict wasn't intentional, it was accidental. They have different ways of disowning their own contribution to conflict.

It's definitely the goal of peace education, I think, and something one could really do in a classroom, to encourage children to see how they contribute to conflicts. One should also give children a sense that it's O.K., that we all do that. We all do things that are upsetting to other people, and sometimes we mean to do these things, sometimes we don't, giving children a sense that we all contribute to conflict. Let's *accept* our responsibility right in the classroom and let's figure out, I mean, how we contribute, because I think once children do that, it's harder for them to blame other

people. I think I really would want to make it harder for children to say: It was him, he's the meany, I didn't do anything.

Up to age 10, children tend to "personalize" enemies; they don't describe the enemy as a member of another ethnic group or cultural group or national group. A switch to a perception of enemies as members of other groups tends to happen between 10 and 12. All of a sudden children spontaneously draw the enemy as a group of people or two groups of people who are fighting each other. They begin to draw flags, so somehow they begin to be aware that enmity has something to do with other nations, with other groups and how groups tend to fight each other. So children around age 10 clearly move beyond the personalized enemy, and I think because of that they are more prone to understand conflicts that involve whole groups. Children at that point also begin to assume more responsibility for their own fights with other individuals. So somewhere between 10 or 12 kids begin to say: Oh, yes, other people see me as the enemy, and I know I do lots of things that may be upsetting to other people. I say things that other people don't like etc.

Starting around 13 years of age – in some children it shows up earlier – children seem to move beyond an identification of enmity with either individuals or groups, and seem to begin to show what some people might call a metacognitive awareness – they become social critics and social philosophers and begin to ask: How come we have conflicts? How come we have wars? So at that age children become very reluctant to portray a particular group as enemies or draw another person as the enemy. They might say: I don't really have enemies, and I don't believe, you know, that you should have enemies. They begin to draw collages of conflict, where they almost seem to say: There are different types of conflicts in the world. There are personal conflicts, there are political conflicts between groups, etc. At this point children become very reluctant to stereotype other groups, and they begin to say: Why do we have conflicts anyway? What can we do about war? Therefore I tend to believe that – as social studies teachers may have sensed intuitively – 13-15 year-olds are a wonderful age group to really discuss different types of conflicts, to take up political discussions and to encourage students to become politically active. I think there is a lot that schools could do to encourage children at that age to really proceed to action: doing things in their own classrooms but also in their own communities that could make a difference or speaking up politically, writing to political leaders in their communities or becoming involved in various projects that actually could change things.

ÅB: When you originally chose your age groups, what were the reasons for these particular ones? You are not studying each separate age level, you compare groups of ages?

PH: Being trained as a developmental psychologist, I have hunches as to where differences might come in. Piaget has actually written a little about children's political development. I had some reason to believe that changes would occur between these groups. Piaget would describe 4-6 year-olds as pre-operational in their thinking, they are much more intuitive, much more spontaneous. So I thought: let's look at 4-6 year-olds as a group and see what they have to say etc.

ÅB: Were the children equally divided into the three age levels within that group of 4 to 6 years?

PH: No, because it's very hard to talk more than very briefly to 4-year-olds, I think most of our subjects in this age group are 5- or 6-year-olds. Among the older children, however, we have an even age distribution within the groups.

ÅB: Were there some sex differences in your results?

PH: There is a certain tendency in our data for young girls to know less about enemies. 4-6-year-old girls frequently haven't heard the word enemy, and when you explain to them what enemies are, they are very reluctant to talk about enemies or to draw enemies. Instead they frequently want to draw good girls, rainbows or other positive things.

Then there are sex differences among the 7-9-year-olds in that boys tend to draw conflicts with other boys, and these tend to be physical conflicts. Girls tend to draw conflicts between girls, but these are frequently more emotional conflicts and verbal quarrels. Girls frequently draw speech-bubbles. So we find some kind of gender segregation in mid-childhood: boys seem to be fighting with boys, and girls seem to be fighting with girls. Many boys, I think, have been told that they are stronger than girls and that they shouldn't beat up girls, that is not a nice thing to do. And I think girls have been told to stay away from boys. They tend to stay away from each other.

In the older age groups – actually primarily among the 10 to 12-year-olds – boys seem to be much freer in their portrayal of intergroup conflict and even seem to sort of enjoy drawing conflicts between groups. They show a lot of shooting and fighting, there are whole armies that march against each other and groups drop bombs on other groups. I've noticed that some boys really draw these images with great enjoyment. Girls 10-12 years old seem to know as much about enemies and conflict as boys, but

seem to be more concerned about the impact or the effects of war, so girls are much more likely than boys to draw graveyards and people who die as a result of war, people who are hurt by war. So girls are also concerned about war and know about war but think more about the victims. Maybe girls continue to personalize conflict more than boys do. I feel that I have to analyze my data more carefully to make that point with confidence, but there is definitely a certain tendency for girls to be more worried about the victims, whereas the boys seem to be more caught up in drawing weapons.

ÅB: Do you work with quantitative content analysis in this research, or do you primarily give illustrative, qualitative descriptions of the children's reactions?

PH: You could see the whole research as predominantly qualitative in its approach, but we definitely also do quantitative analysis of what percentage of children give certain types of reactions. So we have a mixture of qualitative and quantitative techniques in the analyses.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

PH: I might teach psychology. By the way, we have begun to ask children questions about whether it's possible not to have conflicts. That is, we have started to turn my psychological approach into an educational project, almost creating workshops with children. We ask the same questions to get the kids to reflect on their experience in the classroom and their perception of the world and basically take it from there and then have discussions with children about what they think one could do to prevent conflicts.

To come back to how I tried to answer the question initially, it could be interesting to explore with children and young people their conceptions of human nature, the assumptions they have about people. Are people evil? Are people aggressive? What does aggression lead to? Do you believe that you will always have conflicts with other people? Do you believe that countries will always have conflicts with each other? And I found that even 10-12-year olds, and then definitely the older group, are really intrigued by these questions and have a lot to say. In a class on psychology maybe I would begin with some kind of workshop, where I ask the students about their opinions about human nature, about group conflicts. Then, with 14-15-year-olds, I would try to introduce different psychological theories:

for example, you could talk about Freud and his conception that all human beings are aggressive. I would proceed to other theories in psychology that claim that we learn to be aggressive in our environment, so if we grow up in a world that is not peaceful we learn not to be peaceful. In their spontaneous responses about human nature children basically reproduce all major theories of psychology, which is really fascinating.

ÅB: Would you try to promote one of these theories, or how would you deal with this situation to make it a peace education effort?

PH: I would probably explore with the students what the implications for peace education would be of each of those approaches. Given the assumptions of each approach, how would we set up peace education? If all human beings are aggressive, how do you set up peace education? If we believe in social learning theories, how can we create environments that are cooperative, and how can we create all these social models for children that help them to become peaceful? I think that's something you couldn't do quite successfully with kids until they are about 14-15-16 years old. On the other hand, I have always found that younger children as well have always responded very favourably to questions that encourage them to be creative.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

PH: I think that "disarmament education" is too specific. I like "global education", because it acknowledges that we want children and adolescents to move beyond their own egocentric and ethnocentric concerns, and that we want them to be concerned about the future of the world, the future of all nations.

ÅB: What about "peace education"? Is that a term you use in communicating with teachers or colleagues?

PH: It's funny. I used to use "peace education", but I think it has recently become a little bit harder, and let me tell you why. I have been interested in conflict resolution. I have also become more interested in media literacy education, which is a whole field in its own right. Then, because this country is turning totally multi-cultural, I have been interested in multicultural education. "Peace education" would be wonderful as a term as long as we make it clear that peace education involves all of these different aspects. All these specialities are ultimately related, so I think I'm search-

ing for a word or some way of referring to all of them, but there seems to be no such term.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

PH: Let me tell you an anecdote in response to that: Debra, whom you met yesterday and who is the first grade teacher I have been working with, has made it an option for children to salute the flag. They don't have to pledge allegiance to the U.S.A., but they can pledge allegiance to the Earth. That led to reactions from some parents in the community that she was an atheist, that she wasn't patriotic enough and that basically she was an anarchist. So I'm definitely aware that parents can be quite apprehensive about some of the things we do in the classroom. I have also been aware that there are lots of difficult issues you have to deal with. For example, when the Persian Gulf War was going on, and there were children in the classroom whose parents, uncles or aunts were actually soldiers in the Gulf, it was very difficult to conduct peace education in the classroom that didn't make those relatives look bad. It is a real challenge in the classroom to say: "We are against violence, we don't want war", but to make sure at the same time that those children whose relatives are actually in the military don't feel alienated.

I think the way we try to deal with such issues is by talking to parents and other teachers about their ideals and, I think, by talking to people about the fact that nobody wants war, nobody wants their children to be exposed to war; everybody believes in democratic, non-violent solutions to conflicts. I think we've been quite successful in appealing both to parents and to other teachers at that level, and in acknowledging that historically there have been times when it has been very hard to use peaceful means of conflict resolution.

But I think it can also be an interesting chance to make children in the classroom aware that different people have different opinions about war. During the Gulf War we could acknowledge in the classroom that some adults strongly believe that the war was the right thing, but at the same time there were plenty of other people who believed that you shouldn't go to war under any circumstances. There are groups out there that we disagree

with. At the same time it should be part of our ideal not to turn them into our enemy but to keep talking with them and maybe to encourage a more peaceful exchange of views. But it's definitely difficult.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

PH: It should be part of teacher training to take courses in conflict resolution. Student teachers should learn how to encourage age-appropriate conflict resolution skills and take classes on children's political development, how to foster children's political awareness and how to foster children's sense of political responsibility. As part of the schooling in democratic countries, I think it's important for teachers to know what we can actually do to foster skills in children that make them competent participants in a democratic process. That's something I have become really concerned about here, because in the course of my media research I see how much propaganda children are exposed to. Children's education is not democratic, because they are not truly exposed to a whole range of positions or opinions, but are frequently indoctrinated with information; they are not given alternatives to choose between. Teachers should know about multi-cultural education and definitely receive some kind of media literacy training, a training that enables teachers to encourage children to analyze messages from different media critically.

ÅB: Are these things – that you now say are important for teacher training – already within teacher training in the U.S. or are they usually not?

PH: In some places, like the college I am teaching at, they are. My college is very much committed to multi-cultural education and employs researchers who study the political development of children. So I feel I'm working in an environment where there is a strong commitment to train teachers to be peace educators, but I don't think that's generally the case. I feel there are some programs in this country that are very much committed to issues of peace and justice, but not many. Most of them are, I guess, in small private colleges.

ÅB: Are in-service courses given in this area?

PH: There are some, but I feel I don't know enough about it. I know that there are some school systems that actually bring in Educators for Social Responsibility for in-service training, and I know that Educators for Social Responsibility all over the country has link-ups to schools, even through individual teachers who sort of spread the word. I go to quite a few

conferences of educators at the state or national level, and I have a sense that some of these conferences are attended by many teachers and have a lot of workshops on peace education, environmental education, and multi-cultural education, but I cannot tell you what precentage of teachers actually attend these workshops. There are definitely opportunities for teachers to learn about peace education, but I guess the spread is somewhat limited.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

PH: As I said before, I think it's helpful to have multi-cultural classrooms already in pre-school, because the children get so used to each other in this co-existence of cultures that there's a lot less racial tension. Ideally, teachers in those classrooms should draw on the families, like the grandmothers and the parents of the children from these various racial cultural backgrounds, inviting them to come to the classroom and really be part of it – maybe show the kids games, recipes etc. from their cultures. There is a lot of research in social psychology that demonstrates that what people are familiar with they tend to like better.

ÅB: What about the other aspect of my question: Would you expect some difficulties in using this multi-cultural perspective as a component of education for peace?

PH: There is definitely some resistance among parents in communities to become fully multi-cultural. There are still lots of issues involving bussing and the integration of neighbourhoods in this country, so I think it might take a lot of convincing parents in communities that it's in their best interest to create fully multi-cultural classrooms. There is definitely some reluctance among whites in this country right now to let go of their majority status. As researchers maybe we can use arguments with people and demonstrate that a lot of tension could be avoided through truly multi-cultural education, and that this is also in the best interest of the majority.

ÅB: Might there also be difficulties within the *classroom* in utilizing this multi-cultural situation for educational purposes?

PH: Yes. I have painted this ideal picture of kids being raised together from day one, but chances are that we create multi-cultural classrooms at later

points in children's development. White children may be put together with black children or Hispanic children when they enter elementary school, but those children may never have met before. So chances are that there will be racial tensions in the classroom. The real chance could be to accept that those conflicts will occur, and I think that's a real challenge for peace educators. Are we willing to deal with those tensions sympathetically and professionally? I think it can pose a real challenge to our role as teachers to prove that we are. It may bring us in touch with our own prejudices and with our own tendencies to blame others.

The book "White Teacher", by Vivian Paley, published by Harvard Press, is interesting in this context. The Jewish, white teacher had been teaching all-white classrooms, but then moved to Chicago and had to deal with mixed and predominantly black classrooms. She found that she was trying to ignore the colour differences in her classroom, trying very hard to treat all children equally. Then all of a sudden, she found that the black kids were totally acting up, doing all sorts of disruptive things in her classroom. She realized that was because she was ignoring their culture – the difference between her and them. It's fascinating to follow her struggle in making her classroom fully multi-cultural, acknowledging the differences.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

PH: It's interesting because I have always looked at these issues together. This is in part because of my research on enemy images, because I find that adolescents frequently draw both nuclear war and environmental destruction as the enemy. Because of children's responses I think I have always been inclined to see these two together, whether it's destruction through nuclear weapons, or through radiation from nuclear power plants, or some other form of environmental destruction.

There is a temporal component. I have two sets of data from Germany, collected at different points of time. In the first set, kids drew a lot more nuclear weapons and Soviet and American flags and other indicators of superpower conflict. That was a real theme about three years ago. In the

later set of data the nuclear theme has been partly replaced by concerns about the environment. There are still adolescents who draw missiles, and clearly adolescents are aware that all these nuclear missiles are still around. But I would say that the threat to the world environment that was posed by destruction through nuclear arms a few years ago has been partly replaced by adolescents' awareness that we are equally threatened right now by environmental destruction. These two groups share a global concern.

I think that is basically what the issues of nuclear deterrence or nuclear destruction on the one hand, and environmental destruction on the other, have in common. They are all global issues that concern the whole species, and so they should be discussed together, in courses on peace education.The way to link them would be by exploring the history of armaments. What got the arms race started? We should look at the weapon industry and the whole military industrial complex. But then we should also look at developments in technology in general and at the belief in technological solutions and the total disregard of human and environmental consequences as well as the side-effects of this belief in technological perfection and technological solutions. So I think one could show the linkage between those issues, show that they are related and that they are almost different aspects of a problem complex.

At the same time, I have some problem with this whole notion of, or terminology of, survival: nuclear survival and environmental survival. It sounds almost too hopeless. I would prefer to talk about peace-building efforts. I look at peace education as something that should start very early, and that should be brought into children's education and family life throughout their lives. With this progressive peace building, maybe we don't have to be so worried about survival, because we have more confidence in our ability to actually prevent conflicts. In educational efforts at least, we would probably be more successful if we avoided emphasizing the negative aspects too much.

DAVID HICKS (ENGLAND)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

DH: My name is David Hicks. Currently I'm running a curriculum project at the Institute of Education, University of London, which is on alternative futures. But for most of the 1980s I was directly involved in promoting the term and the practice of peace education. I became interested in that field as a result of my post-graduate studies with Paul Smoker at the University of Lancaster, where I discovered peace research, in particular Galtung's writings. I was very impressed and was interested in how I could adapt that and use that with school teachers. Having been a teacher in school, I have then been working with teachers in primary and secondary school for a long time.

So for nine years, from 1980 to 1989, I ran a small unit, called the Center for Peace Studies which was based at a College of Education, called St. Martin's College in Lancaster. Although this was sometimes misconstrued as being something broader and dealing with all aspects of peace and conflict, it was actually meant to give service and support to school teachers.

ÅB: I know that you have been doing project work on World Studies. Could you tell me a little about that?

DH: My initial idea back in 1980 was to set up this unit called the Center for Peace Studies in order to run various projects. In reality I came to focus on one project which was called World Studies 8-13. "World Studies" was the term that got used in England - I guess the American term would be "global education". The label 8-13 refers to the age range. While I think there are some differences between world studies and peace education, I see them both involving a common process in the classroom. I think I spent much of the 80s trying to disentangle what the differences were, if any. I tended to say to teachers that world studies began from a concern about Spaceship Earth or global interdependence, while peace education began with a concern for violence, both direct and structural, but that in the end many of their concerns were overlapping and very similar.

ÅB: Could you also say a few words about your present project on alternative futures?

DH: This is a small curriculum project, in this case funded by the Worldwide Fund for Nature. (All my work over the last 12 or 13 years has

depended on money from trusts and organizations!) I have always been interested in the concept of alternative futures, but I felt that this could do with much more high-lighting than it has received so far. Also my feeling was that in peace education or world studies teachers had often become very good at dealing with the problems - very good at helping young people to understand problems of peace and conflict, global issues, but that one of the results of that often was in fact to *dis*empower young people. They became depressed by learning more about the problems. I think in particular teaching about the nuclear issues brought me face to face with that. The more we help young people understand dilemmas of the earth, the arms race, nuclear winter and so on, the greater risk that they are depressed by the end of it. It seemed to me that one way to give a more empowering experience to young people is not to ignore problems, certainly not, but to also focus on: Where do we want to go? What sort of world do we want? This means to develop young people's and teachers' capacities to dream and have visions, but also having done that, to come back very much to the here and now and to say: What does that mean about what I'm going to be doing in my community, in my school, at home, in relation to my local world and the wider world?

ÅB: Would this project mean that you are developing some exercises and material for teachers that show them how they can do this?

DH: In all my work I see one outcome as being very practical, usable teaching materials. The World Studies 8-13 project has produced two handbooks for teachers. The first one was called "World Studies 8-13", a teachers' handbook that has been fairly successful in the last five years. Last year we produced "Making Global Connections". Part of both of those books contained immediately useful classroom activities. I was also involved in a book on education for peace which was slightly different in that it dealt with a wide range of issues - exploring issues having to do with peace, conflict, race, gender, futures and so on - having just one or two classroom activities at the end of each chapter. That book has not sold anyway near as well as the others!

Coming back to your question: Yes, with my current project - which is actually called the Global Futures Project - part of my commission is to produce, at the end of a three-year period, teaching materials, either for pupils or as resources for teachers. I imagine that I will probably do what I've done before, which is to aim it at teachers for fairly immediate use in the classroom.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

DH: I first think of a process of education. Obviously most of my work has been within the context of classrooms in England and that colours everything that I say. Certainly when peace educators were very active during the early and mid 80s one focus was on the process: What do teaching and learning processes look like in schools, which are non-hierarchical, which promote students' autonomy, students' self-respect, debate and dialogue between students and between students and teachers?

ÅB: What would be some of the aims or objectives of peace education as you see them?

DH: Helping young people understand some of the origins of conflicts, understand manifestations of direct and structural violence, but also equally understanding concepts of peace: What does peace actually look like, what does it feel like, what does it taste and smell like, how do we know when we've got it? One part of that deals with encouraging young people's visions and dreams in as practical a way as possible.

ÅB: Would you say that you would cover both knowledge and attitudes?

DH: Yes. One of the things I used a lot with teachers on in-service courses and that I used in the book for teachers was a breakdown of knowledge, attitudes and skills, spelling out various substantive areas that I felt could be looked at, as well as attitudes that should be promoted and skills that needed to be developed.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

DH: The answer is very short and is: No. It was a "good grammar-school education" in the 1950s. It didn't have much to say about either the process of peace education or the substantive concerns.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

DH: I think the answer has to be: A little and possibly less than they did previously. I think that during the mid 1980s there was quite a significant, but small network of teachers, schools and local authorities in England that were positively promoting peace education as part of their everyday

concerns.

Partly because of attacks by the political Right, but in particular because of the major changes that the Thatcher government has introduced in both the management of schools and the curriculum in schools, I'm afraid to say that peace education per se as a concern of teachers now has been almost totally buried by the everyday worries and concerns.

Having said that, I think I should add that many teachers who had specifically promoted a peace education or a world studies approach, would still be doing that, but I think without using the term "peace education". I also think that quite a lot of what goes on in what we would call infant schools (5-7) and in junior school (7-11) is about cooperative skills, learning together, working together, respecting each other, so I think that on one level, peace education *does* go on in a good primary school, but it is not necessarily called such, and it is not what we would consider a fully developed peace education, but some elements of it. And by the time you get to secondary school with all its subjects and the bell ringing every forty minutes to change rooms, anything related to peace education is much less likely to happen!

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

DH: I remember that when I came to an IPRA conference in the late 70s and to the Peace Education Commission, there were several people who gave me the distinct impression that we could not talk about peace education in schools, that it would be a contradiction in terms, that by definition schools promoted structural violence. Schools are, however, quite a significant arena for debate, although it is difficult to introduce reforms. But obviously, I am not quite pessimistic. Steps and measures, in my experience, for empowerment can be good in-service work with teachers, for example, a residential weekend, where one has time with a group of teachers. They enjoy looking at their own practice and process, using the procedures of peace education as part of in-service. The sharing, the support, the debate, the dealing with controversy is something which many teachers find very stimulating. Whenever possible, we try to work with more than one teacher from a school. Obviously head teachers have an important role to play. Certainly I have seen in some places clear examples where good in-service work, supportive head teachers, and a positive

approach from the local authority really did promote some exciting things in the school.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

DH: I will want to qualify in a moment, but I think one of the main differences is this: Primary teachers dealing with the children from 5 to 11 will very much look at conflicts and cooperation and issues that deal with fairness or justice, that is, deal with the classroom climate and the school atmosphere. They will deal with conflicts in the playground, in the classroom, developing cooperative games for example. In the secondary school, however, it would be more likely that someone would say: Well, in history I am working with the relationship between the superpowers after World War II. Or: In geography, I am looking at issues of development and underdevelopment. Or: In English, we are looking at some teenage science fiction stories about the holocaust or we are looking at poetry and literature that deals with peace and conflict. Having said that, I want to add that my experience also is that children aged 8-11 in primary school can be very interested in particular issues, both local and global, and in their own way are quite knowledgable, so I think there is a place also with younger children for looking at particular issues.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

DH: I originally practiced as a geography teacher and I always used to feel that geography had a fairly major role to play in helping young people understand the world. If I was doing it again I would go back to the framework that I have often used and that I got originally from Galtung. He wrote somewhere once that the problems of peace have to do with inequality, injustice, environmental damage and alienation. I find that a very useful categorization. Geography tends to overlook injustice, but is very good at looking at environmental issues. I suspect geography doesn't look much at issues that have to do with alienation, although in academic geography considerable work has been done on, for example, the geography of crime and the geography of disease. Turning those four

problems round, as Galtung once said, illustrates the values underlying peace. This is a way to help young people understand issues to do with what economic welfare looks like, what social justice looks like, what environmental diversity looks like, and what participation looks like. I would want to spend much more time certainly than I used to looking at how those positive values can be expressed - case studies of those on different scales, so as I said earlier that students finish up knowing as much about the geography of peace as they do about war. There was an interesting book written on the geography of peace and war sometime back - for college and university students - and sadly that contained much more geography of war, but it dealt also with geography of peace. This is always the dilemma. I am very anxious to not get away from the problems, but pay *more* attention to positive examples.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

DH: I know when I first came across the term "disarmament education" - I think it was in Magnus Haavelsrud's book - on the one hand I could understand that it was conceptually valuable within peace education. But I also thought that in busy classrooms and with busy teachers you don't start with that sort of terminology and that it wasn't helpful at all. It was difficult enough helping teachers to understand peace education, as a term they were not used to, without adding disarmament education as well!

The term "education for international understanding" I look upon as rather "wet". It has been used rather loosely in the U.K. for a long time. From the 1920s on there is a tradition in England of education for international understanding, but in these days we're more likely to talk about global education or peace education. I think people in England find the terms "global education" and "world studies" less threatening than peace education. It doesn't sound as subversive as peace education! Certainly the project that I was involved with - the World Studies 8-13 Project - had a much wider take-up than things I did under a peace education heading, and teachers sometimes commented: "I'm really glad that project was called 'World Studies'; if it would have been called Peace Education 8-13, my head teacher wouldn't have allowed me to come on the course." I actually think that one can equally study issues of peace and conflict under a global

education heading.

ÅB: Is the term world studies used generally in your country or is it fairly specific for your project?

DH: It's not used generally in the sense that most teachers would be conversant with it - unless they have come across some of the few projects that use that term. York University has a Centre for Global Education. They changed their name from including world studies to global education. I guess they felt global education gave a broader feel than world studies.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

DH: That was certainly the case in the mid 80s in England, partly because the Right-wing press and Right-wing politicians argued that peace education was about nuclear disarmament and this made good headlines. The politicians from the Right and the newspapers made a big fuss about such things at that time.

I spent a lot of time during the 80s talking to teachers and governors. I explained that when we talk about peace education, we are actually talking about looking at peace and conflict, at human rights, at issues of development and at environmental issues. Many times after a session with teachers or governors, a person would come up and say: "Well, I am so relieved now that I know what peace education is about. Of course I am happy to promote it. I can now argue with people whereas before I was a bit worried. I thought that peace education perhaps was solely promoting nuclear disarmament." So my job was often to bring support to people who had relied too much on sensational newspaper headlines.

ÅB: Do you feel that this is still a problem?

DH: I don't think it's a problem now in the same sense: the nuclear arms race has gone out of the headlines, peace education has gone out of the headlines in England. The educational debate now is about the local management of the schools and about the National Curriculum.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

DH: Clearly part of teacher training courses needs to be related very much to the concerns of peace education or global education. There were some examples of that earlier. One of my early pieces of research in the mid 70s was about what teacher training courses existed that dealt with global issues, and there was an interesting mixture of geographers, historians, religious education teachers dealing with peace issues. But the mid 70s in England was also when teacher training was changing from a Teacher's Certificate to a Bachelor of Education degree, and with the tightening up that came in the B.Ed. degree, many of those courses disappeared. You would, I think, now only find them where you had an enthusiast in the college of education or university who particularly wanted to run a unit or a module on world studies.What I would like to see would be that for all students training to be teachers some foundation course existed under a heading of global education. I hope that may still be possible at some future date.

ÅB: What about in-service training in this area?

DH: I think that projects like World Studies 8-13 and other groups that promote global education have often given in-service courses which gained a high reputation because they were very participatory and enjoyable, whereas traditional in-service courses tend to be seen as extraordinarily boring, because university experts come in and tell teachers what they need to know and then go away again.

ÅB: Would such in-service courses be available to most teachers?

DH: Not now, because of money restrictions. I do know one or two Local Educational Authorities that are running world studies in-service courses now, but time and money constraints are very much limiting what is possible.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

DH: One of the things that happened in England was that schools that had a high proportion of children from ethnic minorities and therefore were very concerned about multi-cultural education or anti-racist education often saw peace education as being irrelevant to their needs. It was thought that the prime concern of school should be to combat racism and that very clear school policies needed to exist on that and very firm examples needed to be given by teachers on, for example, racist abuse and so on, and these

teachers often had an image of peace education as being rather "wet". So it was often difficult to get people directly involved in multi-cultural education to also look at peace education.

The loudest voices in multi-cultural education were often those of black teachers, and the experience of black people in Britain both currently and historically has generally been a most oppressive one, and black teachers would often say to me: "Look, white people are not going to change unless they are confronted." As a peace educator I have reservations about confrontation, but I had difficulties arguing this with black colleagues. I always felt that I needed to respect their approach. So in fact, there has not been much of cooperation between peace education and multi-cultural education.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

DH: I think they should both be dealt with - certainly with older pupils - and I think environmental issues can also be dealt with with younger people. I would go back to my earlier remarks on how do we help young people look at major issues like this and yet become empowered? So one of the things I want to do about environmental issues would be looking at what organizations locally and nationally are doing and why they are doing what they are doing, so that children understand for instance Greenpeace and local conservation groups and so that they can see examples of change occurring. Perhaps I would start with that and then say: Why are people doing this? - and then look back and see what the initial problems were, rather than starting with the problems which I think can often become depressing.

13.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

DH: One of the things I have learnt over the last ten years is perhaps just personal to me: it's something about being like a chameleon in terms of changing my colours somewhat in the light of circumstances, which is

certainly not changing my substantive concerns and values. For example, quite clearly it's environmental issues that concern people now. So I'm very happy to put my weight and my support behind helping teachers teach about environmental issues more effectively - which is not to neglect other issues. That is what young people are worried most about at the moment, that is what adults are worried about most at the moment. So in terms of starting with the reality of young people and teachers I would be very happy to start there, but then to spin the way from there to embrace other issues as well.

I also have a hunch, yet to be confirmed, that the year 2000 - the whole thing about moving from one millennium to another - will act as quite a powerful idea or focus for people. We enter into the last decade of a century, the last decade of a millennium - this idea seems to me potentially quite a powerful one for new beginnings and new ideas, and I suspect that during the 90s this focus will be one that surfaces a lot more. I would hope that it will also provide a focus for looking more thoughtfully at what we mean by just and sustainable futures, locally and globally.

MITSUO OKAMOTO (JAPAN)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

MO: My name is Mitsuo Okamoto, and I come from Japan. I teach at Hiroshima Shudo University. At the moment I am president of the Peace Studies Association of Japan, which has over 700 members. We will be the host organization of the next IPRA Conference in 1992.

I have been engaged in Peace Studies instruction for the last 17 years or so. I am the founder of the first formal university level peace studies course in Japan, created in 1976, but I was teaching in this area even before the establishment of this formal course. Three years ago this was developed into an international peace studies course utilizing five faculty members. This was at my former university, Shikoku Gakuin University. Since April, 1990 I have been at Hiroshima Shudo University, where I am also professor of peace studies. A new peace studies course was set up there in the Department of International Political Science. So I have been teaching peace studies to university students for the last 16 or 17 years.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

MO: Well, we have a very special history of peace education in Japan, which was started mainly by the Hiroshima-Nagasaki survivors and later joined by teachers. Because peace education is often seen as connected with leftist politics, when you say peace education, some people who claim to be neutral have certain reservations whether one should support it or not. So I don't use the word peace education, but peace studies, to make the content – which is nothing but peace education – more acceptable to people who have some standard preconceived idea about what peace education is. Also, I feel that I can include more subject matter in peace studies than we would under the heading of peace education. For example, violence against nature, the destruction of nature can be easily be included in peace studies. For the university level, the term peace studies, I think, gives some impression of a) a more comprehensive content and b) a more higher-education oriented subject matter than peace education.

ÅB: When you think of the school level, would you then use the term peace education, or would you use the expression peace studies also for the

younger students?

MO: I have been thinking about this possibility, but I think peace studies may sound a little too sophisticated for elementary school children, for example.

ÅB: Would you like to think of peace education as also including other things than knowledge? Would it also deal with values and attitudes, for example?

MO: Yes, definitely. It must include not only knowledge, cognition, but also values and attitudes. In addition, the teaching must be more experience-oriented. Transferring knowledge to one another is not enough, so I usually take students to places like Hiroshima and Nagasaki or to an island in the Philippines where people live in a very poor situation. It is very stimulating for students, because they see what real poverty is, and they experience what the Hiroshima people have been suffering. I arrange conversations with the survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki for the students. These people are aging and very fond of talking with young people, and the students are excited to talk with these people and share their experience, and this is a very stimulating encounter.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

MO: On the contrary. I was educated during the war time, and then every unit was related to war education. It was only after Japan was defeated that the teachers changed their attitude 180 degrees and started talking about democracy, peace, freedom and so forth. I am grateful for this short period after the war where a genuine peace education was practiced in Japanese schools – junior high schools and senior high schools. I think teachers then were excited about the peace constitution of Japan, which forbids the solution of international disputes by using armed forces, and they really believed in this peace constitution – first because we lost the war, and second because of the experiences related to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and I think I am a child, so to speak, of this after-war peace education.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

MO: I have a very negative evaluation of our present system. Japanese

people have gained confidence because of our economic success, and now many Japanese people, particularly conservative people, are becoming very nationalistic again. This is also reflected in the curriculum in the school education. For example, the Japanese Minister of Education discourages the teachers from teaching about Japanese aggression in the Korean peninsula and in China. Euphemistic terms are used to make the past sound neutral or even beautiful. For example, it is emphasized that we built up the infrastructure in Korea, and therefore Korea was able to develop its technology. We find a self-glorifying re-evaluation of the Japanese involvement in the Pacific war. I think teaching this is detrimental to children. We need a more objective history of the violent relations between Japan and other countries, where war was the perpetuator of violence. So my answer to your question is that I think schools in my country are contributing to the opposite of peace education. Also, the recent resurgence of the popularity of the imperial (Tenno) system strengthens the more nationalistic, self-centered type of education.

ÅB: Is this a very general phenomenon, or are there schools or teachers that work in a more peace-oriented way?

MO: Very general.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

MO: Yes, it's possible. It's difficult in Japan, because the Minister of Education imposes certain restrictions or constraints on teachers by guidelines, and teachers are required to stick to these in their teaching. They cannot deviate from these guidelines, which are very nationalistic and self-centered. But at the same time I think that *if* the teachers were well-trained in peace education, or *if* they spent two or three months in a course on peace education or peace research during the summer period, perhaps in another country, then perhaps the guidelines formulated by the government would not be equally constraining, and the teachers could do a lot for peace education.

ÅB: Would you think that there would be possibility in Japan to influence the school system or the guidelines for teaching so that there would be more peace education?

MO: At the moment: No. As long as the Liberal-Democratic Party continues to rule, it is, I think absolutely impossible to influence this.

Katsuya Kodama reported in Nagasaki, when we had the peace education conference ten days ago, that in Sweden, peace education is even encouraged by the school authorities. Unless the government changes from the Liberal-Democratic Party to the Socialist Party, for example, this is not possible in Japan. So we are hoping for a change of government.

6.
ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?
MO: This, I think, is a difficult question to answer. However, I think peace education for the smaller children can often start from the actions of the children. For example, young children are, in my experience, interested in ridiculing other children because of differences they have. For instance, if somebody has a different accent, the other children ridicule him or her. This kind of aggressive attitude of the majority can be corrected in some way, so that the young children can be made to understand that people are different in many ways – some people speak the same language with a different accent. They can be shown audio-visual material where related stories are communicated. With the older students, I think various kinds of fieldwork are perhaps more effective, and the students can easily leave campus. With younger children one must be very careful in taking them to the streets or to some violent sector of a larger city, while older students can do that, being themselves very careful about their own protection.

7.
ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?
MO: I think that in most subjects I would use methods similar to those I referred to earlier. I invite the survivors of Hiroshima to come to my class and have them speak to my students; this is more effective in making the students conscious of the peace issues than if I just told them about Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I also think the audio-visual method is more effective than just the lecture type of instruction. Thirdly, I think students must leave campus to learn by working, to learn by looking at situations which lack peace, in our country or overseas.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

MO: We touched on this earlier. I prefer the term "peace studies" or "peace research", or even expressions like "conflict resolution". I tend to avoid the term "peace education", since it has a certain negative connotation in some circles. However, in Japan there are differences of opinion in this respect, and every year we have a peace education symposium. Usually it takes place in Hiroshima, but this year it took place in Nagasaki. There the term "peace education" is in focus. It is mainly visited by junior high and senior high teachers and elementary school teachers. We organized a university peace studies section about five years ago, but this is a minority in this set-up. This year I was the keynote speaker of the symposium. The symposia are arranged by a permanent organization, called, I think, The Hiroshima Institute for Peace Education; the headquarters is in Hiroshima. This group also publishes a magazine on peace education.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

MO: One of the difficulties will be that "peace" is often seen as connected with communism and socialism, with people to the left or something like that, and if the members of the board of education in a certain place are conservative, then they don't like the introduction of peace education in schools. Then I try to persuade these people by using the term "peace studies", stressing that in peace studies we deal not only with education against war, but also with human rights, violence against nature, equality, democracy etc.

ÅB: But since word "peace" is used in both expressions, wouldn't peace studies be as "bad" as peace education?

MO: Logically this is true. But I think that peace education in our country is now a set term with some unfortunate connotations; but what is peace studies? I use this latter term as an opportunity to explain what I have in mind, what I want to communicate.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

MO: There are two ways. One is to introduce the full-fledged peace studies course in the old pedagogical department to teach peace studies. Teachers can be trained by taking some three or four core courses on peace studies, and then this can be a major contribution to the ability of teachers to teach about peace when they become professional teachers. Secondly, if this is not possible, we could set up a kind of summer course, as in-service training for teachers, for four or five weeks, giving them an opportunity to get themselves immersed in the area of peace, whereby we not only teach teachers the various contents of peace studies, but also the attitude or the basic philosophy related to peace education. In other words, we would deal with a peaceful way of living, a peaceful life style which does not violate other people's human rights or the rights of other living beings. So it should not only cover the transfer of knowledge, but should also deal with peaceful behavior where we refrain from exploiting nature and other people.

ÅB: You mentioned two possibilities: Would you say that some of these opportunities exist in Japan today?

MO: The international peace studies course in my former university is within the sociology department, but it can also be offered to teacher trainees. And the same is true of some other peace studies courses. So it does exist to a limited extent. The second form does not exist at present in Japan. But the peace education symposium mentioned earlier – which lasts for only two days – can be mentioned here again: It's not a satisfactory institution for in-service training, but something which *partly* fulfills what I have in mind. I heard that some African students study peace research in Oslo for a couple of summer months, being able to go back to educate children about peace. This kind of long-term arrangement is very much desirable.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

MO: We have an increasing number of students from the Philippines, Thailand, Indo-China, Taiwan, China, Korea, and other countries. Not only

students, but also workers come to Japan from these countries to earn Japanese money, which is a strong currency today. So in any university, as opposed to 10-15 years ago, we have a number of foreign students on the campuses. I think it is a great opportunity, particularly since Japan has become more nationalistic and self-centered, to have these students talk about their own country, thereby having students listen to these foreign students, noting their different world views or different customs. I think this kind of exposure to different foreign cultures could open up the narrow-minded attitude of Japanese students if it's done properly. If it's done without any preparation, such communication might strengthen the prejudice against foreigners. But if it's well prepared, then I think this kind of communication is a unique opportunity whereby people could become more internationally minded, more open-minded, they could be made to understand that people are basically the same all over the world with many values and with peaceful intentions.

12.
ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?
MO: I don't think they are two categories, in fact. In my view, the nuclear catastrophe is a form of violence which is a symbol of all violence, all phenomena of violence, manifested in different ways. The nuclear power is not war, but the Chernobyl nuclear accident illustrates that it may damage the environment, kill people, and devastate the entire region. Violence (war) between nations, violence against the weak within a society, the poor people, and violence against nature – the ecological issue – they are all related. I don't regard these different phenomena as different categories, but rather they belong to the same category revolving around the concept of violence. Therefore my concept of peace is more comprehensive than just the absence of war; it deals with absence of all those kinds of violence.

13.
ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?
MO: I think more international exchange of educational ideas would be

very important. Japanese teachers in general know very little about how school children can be taught about peace, war, violence, ecology, racism and so forth, but such an opportunity of exchange might be very helpful. So I think that extended international interaction of peace educators or peace researchers in different countries is extremely important. This is what we have been doing in our IPRA conferences, but I think it is important to get the politicians involved, get the bureaucrats at the ministries of education involved in this kind of international exchange of information. We hope that our politicians, people working in our Ministry of Education or people who are serving the Board of Education in the local area will have some opportunity to have communication with teachers and officers in the educational ministries in other countries, for example in the Scandinavian countries or other parts of Europe.

PAUL ROGERS (NORTHERN IRELAND) & MAURA WARD (IRELAND)

1.

ÁB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

MW: I am a member of the Presentation Congregation which was founded in Ireland, principally for the education of the poor. I have been a teacher for 36 years, 18 years at primary level and 18 at post primary level. I had a great interest in the less-able students and tried to ensure that even the weakest students had a programme of education that suited them. Consequently I got involved in curriculum development in an effort to provide such programmes. I think it was because of this interest I was asked to become a member of the secretariat of the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace. My main work is in peace education.

PR: I first got interested in the world of peace education about 12 years ago when I applied for a teacher fellowship in peace education which was to be based at the University of Ulster, Belfast. I got that fellowship, and during the year I travelled and investigated what was happening in peace education in the British Isles, in Holland and in America. I visited also the United World College of the Atlantic, in Wales, which was at that time the only school, I think, in the British Isles which offered any kind of peace studies course.

At the end of that year I produced a syllabus for secondary schools and a small teaching booklet to back up the first part of that syllabus which was focused on peace and the individual. The syllabus itself was in four parts, working from the individual, community, national and international level, but I only, because of the time scale of the fellowship, was able to produce teaching materials for the first part of it. When I went back to teaching, I used those materials in my own classroom. Teachers from various parts of the world also used them and gave me informal feedback on their use.

Six years ago, I got an opportunity to do the Master's degree in education, and part of that work meant that I was able to formally evaluate the materials I had produced myself. I wrote a dissertation on peace education entitled "Peace Education - Theory and Practice in the Curriculum". The first half was a theoretical resumé of peace education and what it meant, and the second half reported on the practical evaluation of teaching materials on peace education in the classroom.

Five years ago the Justice and Peace Commission asked me to be part of

the Management Committee of the Joint Peace Education Programme for which I am now working, and three years ago I left school and took up a full-time appointment with that programme as a Peace Education Officer based in Belfast, that is The Joint Peace Education Programme of the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace and the Irish Council of Churches.

ÅB: Could you also tell me a little about the character of your present work?

MW: The Irish Commission for Justice and Peace is concerned with policy, research and education in the fields of human rights, development, justice and peace. The Commission became involved in peace education initially out of a deep concern for the Northern Ireland conflict. It worked to build up a long-term, comprehensive ecumenically integrated programme with the Irish Council of Churches - The Joint Peace Education Programme - which is unusual, if not unique, being an integrated project involving all the main churches operating on an all-Ireland basis across two political jurisdictions. The structure of the Joint Peace Programme itself involves an important peace education process. Both Paul and I work on this programme for the Commission. We work with staffs and students in schools. We give one or two day training sessions to teaching staffs on the promotion of peace and justice in schools. Occasionally we give sessions to students on topics requested by teachers. Teachers contact us for materials and other resources that may be of help to them in school. Because so many have asked us for materials for schools we develop materials on peace and justice for use in both primary and post-primary schools.

This is the process we use in the development of the materials. We plan a series of topics to work on. Every summer we have a workshop during which teachers from Ireland, North and South, Catholic and Protestant, come together and brainstorm on the chosen topics. They work with us for a week during which we worked out a framework for a module or two. Then the three peace education officers work on it and get it ready for piloting in schools. The pilot study takes place in about 20-30 schools to make sure that it's suitable to for all types of schools. The materials have to be worked out simultaneously in and for two education systems, one in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland. Then, following the recommendations from the teachers involved in the piloting, we revise the text, sometimes together, sometimes separately, until we bring it to the stage of final publishing.

We have a primary school programme for the 8-12 age group *"Free to Be"*, dealing with the promotion of self-worth and self-awareness and the

analysis and understanding of actions and attitudes, awareness of people of other races and faiths, the use of words and symbols, the environment and finally people of peace. It can be used not only in primary schools but also in junior post-primary.

Another programme for upper primary, junior post-primary *"Looking at Churches and Worship in Ireland"* aims more specifically at promoting an awareness and understanding of different Church traditions and breaking down barriers, prejudices and suspicions between students from different religious traditions.

A development education module for 9-13 year olds *"So Everybody Fights"* was published in 1988, on the relationship between world development and world disarmament. It is suitable for upper primary and junior post-primary.

This module covers quite a lot besides development. It also helps the students to understand the concepts as they relate to their everyday lives. It is a very popular programme with teachers.

PR: Our most recent work is on a series of materials for postprimary schools (11-16 year old) called "The Sedekah Peace Programme". "Sedekah" is a Hebrew word which is sometimes translated into English as 'justice' or 'righteousness', but it has a more complex meaning in the original Hebrew which could be translated as "God's power to put things right in human community and in nature".

MW: The first module of this series was "Peacemaker". It consists of eight units, and it seeks to develop knowledge and skills which would help students understand and cope with conflicts at different levels - in their own lives and in the wider society: national and global. Its general aim is to help students to be more at peace with themselves and with others whoever and wherever those others are. It doesn't seek to promote any specific religious or political views, but it does encourage the recognition and development of social skills and values and stresses the importance of a positive self-image.

It is an activity-based program involving the students as much as possible through working on projects, taking part in role-play, group discussions, reaching consensus, and brain-storming. It's a teacher's book, with photocopiable work-sheets for the students. We are not in the money-making business; what we really want to do is to promote peace and justice.

ÅB: What would be the age level that you intend it for?

MW: It is intended for 12-14 year olds, i.e. the first and second years in the post-primary school, but it is quite flexible and can be used at different age

levels, we think, using different examples. In the Republic of Ireland we find that it is used very much in the Transition Year with 15-16 year olds (after the students take the first departmental examination, the Intermediate Certificate, students take a year to study topics that help them to broaden their horizons before preparing for the next examination). It is also used in work-experience classes e.g. The Vocational Preparation Training Course with 15-16 year old students.

ÅB: How are the units written originally? Are you dividing the writing between yourself, or do you have teachers from the field involved also?

MW: We do the final writing ourselves.

PR: We have groups of teachers working on the ideas in workshops initially, and then one of us takes the major responsibility for writing. Maura (based in Dublin) and myself (based in Belfast) have worked together on our second module entitled "Power To Hurt - Exploring Violence" which is aimed at 12-15 year olds.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

PR: What I would think of first would be my job: Something that's good to be involved in, something that is very valuable, something that isn't just the normal run of the mill, something that could make a difference to people's lives and help make the world a better place. For the past thirteen years I've seen very positive and encouraging developments in Peace Education and this is extremely heartening.

MW: Yes, I think I would feel the same as Paul: Peace education is something worthwhile. It deals not only with disarmament, but with people at peace with themselves and others, peace with justice. In school, it should be part of many subjects, not just standing alone. It should be further promoted through the ethos of the school so that what the students experience in their interaction with others is not at variance with the values taught.

We look on peace education as a permanent response to conflict in general with the corresponding necessity to develop a positive approach both to peacemaking and to the development of people who internalise a live vision of peace, have a real sense of justice, personal and social, are sensitised to the various social manifestations of violence and conflict in their own lives and in the wider world, have the knowledge, skills and motivation to work effectively, opposing violence, dealing constructively

with conflict and actively building peace in the different situations in which they find themselves, have a personal commitment to non-violence, both as a way of life and as a means of changing society with the necessary skills, knowledge and attitude.
PR: It aims at improved relations at all levels (personal, national and international), as well as at improved self-awareness or self-image, involving a feeling of empowerment.

3.
ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?
PR: My own schooling did involve much attention to values, such as being responsible, having a "second chance", patience and caring for others. There was no explicit peace education, but a very definite implicit recognition of many of the values related to peace.
MW: In general, there was not much in my old school that was known as peace education. However, just as Paul indicated, much took place in religion classes and in the school in general promoting corresponding values.

4.
ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?
MW: Some schools are involved in peace education, some are not directly involved. Any true education is peace education as it develops all aspects of the students, helping them to become good citizens. Because of the troubles in our country I would think that all schools are aware of the need to promote peace. We are developing our modules at the request of teachers who were looking for suitable materials, so that would indicate their anxiety to promote peace in their classrooms. Are you asking if the structure of the schools or their ethos promotes peace? Yes, I think that, in general, this happens, but the competitive element and the striving for results in schools may not always be conducive to it.
PR: Aspects of peace education are often dealt with under other headings, such as Careers Education, Life Skills, Religious Education, Counselling, History, Geography, English etc.
MW: Boys' schools have been more "academic" than others, but I notice new developments in them. Many of these schools have approached us for help and guidance in the promotion of peace and justice in their schools.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

MW: Yes, there is much that can be done. Openness is important. School staffs can be helped to be more conscious of the need to promote peace in their schools. Experts should be invited to the schools to speak to the teachers and students about peace and justice issues in order to raise awareness. The young people in schools should be encouraged to research these issues and, if possible, to become involved in the alleviation of some of the problems. This could be done through an annual peace project inviting young people to investigate various issues, follow them through during the year and present their findings in their class, school or locality.

PR: I agree. Materials are also important. Well planned, well presented teaching materials, appropriate to the age and ability of the students, are vital prerequisites to good peace education. It is now widely accepted that there cannot be good curriculum development without good teacher development and, therefore, teachers are central to developing peace education curriculum.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

MW: That is difficult to answer, since it depends much on the total context. We aim at an education where students learn from experience and this experience can be adapted to various ages and interests.

PR: The only difference I would think of would be related to what the students would be able to cope with as determined by their developmental stage. Activity and experiential learning are most important for all age groups.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

MW: If I were a teacher of civics, I would have many opportunities to deal with explicit peace education. If I were teaching English, I would use texts to analyze conflicts, violence and injustice, and I would try to make the

students aware of alternatives.

PR: Most subjects could be dealt with from the point of view of peace education very easily. For example, I would like to deal with third world development issues in Geography and History. The New York Intercommunity Centre for Justice and Peace have developed an excellent workshop for teachers on the process of "infusing" justice and peace topics into mainstream curriculum subjects. The process and results are very impressive and we are about to begin some teacher workshops on this process for teachers in Ireland.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

MW: "Disarmament education" is very narrow. This deals only with one very small aspect of "peace education".

PR: I like the term "peace education". It is a more allembracing term than some of the others and suggests a more positive approach. It is also now a fairly well established term internationally and is gaining ground in our country. "Education for international understanding" and some of the other terms you mention are more restrictive than "peace education".

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

MW: There are some difficulties, but less so than in other countries due to the fact that we are a neutral country. Violence and negative intergroup attitudes have played such an big role in our society, it should be easy for people to see the need for some kind of peace education.

PR: Our schools in Northern Ireland exist in a very divided and often violent society. Our own community violence has resulted in a number of teachers searching for a role in helping to solve our political, social and economic problems. A lot of goodwill exists at all levels in this search, but there are those (parents included) who would vigorously object to schools being involved in this kind of work. Parents and pupils in such instances,

should have the right to withdraw from these activities but those who wish to carry on with curriculum experimentation in this area should also have the right to work at building a more just and peaceful society here.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

PR: There is a need to raise awareness in teacher education regarding the possibilities of peace education. We also need to bring schools together across the political and religious domains. There is something being done in teacher training related to peace education, but not to the degree that we would like. The same is true for in-service training. There have been some courses, but there is a great need for more. In Northern Ireland we have introduced the term "Education For Mutual Understanding" to a new common curriculum. Peace Education has a lot to offer this new area.

MW: It is very important that teacher training colleges introduce "Peace Education" into their courses. Young teachers need to be comfortable with their subject and if they learn to promote peace through their teaching while in school and are made aware of the need to do so they will more readily do this when they are appointed to a school. Groups of teachers who have had the experience of working in the Third World have been active in this area, helping to promote peace and justice education in our schools.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

MW: I think having a variety of backgrounds can be a marvellous aid. It depends, however, on the ethos of the school and the use made of this aid. To get it to work well, teachers, students, parents and the local community should work together.

PR: Most of our schools do not have big cultural or national differences because most tend to have only pupils from one cultural tradition, i.e. Catholic/Nationalist, Protestant/Unionist, but where they do exist, I think it is very appropriate to utilize this as an aid to peace education. One of our main tasks in peace education in Northern Ireland is to encourage a coming together of teachers and pupils from the two separated school systems. A lot of new work and experience is emerging in this field and this is

encouraging.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

MW: I find it very natural to include the problems of environmental damage in projects relating to peace education, and we did so in our very first material. In the module "Power to Hurt", there is reference to the environment right through the module as we consider any abuse of the environment to be an act of violence.

PR: I agree. The theme "Justice, Peace and the Environment" has also been a central focus in recent discussions between the Christian churches as in the Basel Assembly of Churches in May 1989. I suppose, as peace educators, we should also be extremely concerned not to present students with too negative a picture. We have to be realistic, but we should always be on guard against students feeling too depressed and powerless.

13.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

MW: I think that greater efforts should be made through organisations such as IPRA to have Peace Education included in the national curricula for schools in every country. We know from experience that only teachers dedicated to peace education will work at its promotion unless it is a subject or part of a subject for public examination.

BOGDAN ROWIŃSKI (POLAND)

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

BR: After my studies at the University of Warsaw, the Faculty of Education, I had teaching jobs in different schools for youngsters. Then I changed to study youth problems in a research institute. I started work there in 1986, so I have worked about four years now as a researcher. The general idea of our work has been to answer questions from various bodies of the government, and I can also initiate questions myself and try to answer these questions. The questions studied are usually connected with the present situation of our country. From the beginning of my job at the institute, I have worked with peace education.

ÅB: Could you describe a little bit more the work of this research institute and its department of peace education?

BR: The origin of this department is the patriotic and defense education. I think that this concept has a longer tradition in Poland than peace education. The questions for this patriotic education usually came from the military service because the idea of patriotic education is to prepare young people to serve for the country. Of course, it is difficult not to see the question of peace education, so recently the boss of the institute decided to develop this problem area, and the term "peace education" was added to the name of our department to make it wider. The leader of the department is a professor of education and then there are two girls and I as research staff; we all have a doctoral degree.

ÅB: I know that the institute has done several surveys. Could you briefly say something about these surveys; what were their aims and general character?

BR: In general, the aims of the surveys have been to describe youth consciousness, in various areas. In the area of ecology we call it ecology consciousness; in the area of peace we call it peace consciousness; and in the area of patriotic defence, patriotic consciousness. Then a second aim has been to give proposals for educational practice in school programs, for youth organizations and for youth policy. The third aim has been to give proposals to government bodies, for instance to the Ministry of Youth or to the Ministry of Defense.

ÅB: How do you use the word "consciousness" in this connection? When you say "peace consciousness", for example, how would you define it?

BR: This is quite difficult to say briefly. In the literature there is no such concept of "peace consciousness". We use the term "consciousness" to describe youth attitudes and opinions in general, but then we have measured youth attitudes towards specific areas with specific instruments. When I have measured views in an area, I can use an operational definition of "consciousness" in that area.

ÅB: You use the expressions "patriotic consciousness" and "patriotic education". These are terms which are unusual in Sweden. Would there not be some kind of conflict between the patriotic education and peace education?

BR: Yes, there might be, because patriotic education is education which aims to prepare young people to deal with arms. In the defence situation they should be prepared to defend their country, and one of the foundations of this attitude is the view of the enemy. You need to have an enemy to prepare yourself to protect against him. In general, in peace education we say there are no real enemies, so this is, I think, some possible conflict between the two concepts.

ÅB: Has patriotic education been a concept used for a long time in Poland?

BR: Yes. It is related to the situation of the two political blocks.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

BR: I think that this is one of the most important areas of education. For me first of all, this is a positive education: it is education towards something – real peace. But it includes also negative education, it is education against something – against armament and the arms race etc. This is an education which starts from the birth, and it never ends.

ÅB: If you should say something more specifically about what you would aim for in peace education, could you give some examples?

BR: In general, this is education to prepare people to change the world in a positive way and to make them feel that they are able to change it. You feel you can do something, and if you feel this, you are responsible, so the next step is education towards responsibility. This is in general terms, and of course we can then state different particular aims for different age levels.

At the kindergarten level, for example, the children do not have wider knowledge, so we have to focus on creating positive emotions towards other children – black children, yellow children and persons from other countries. We have to teach them how to cooperate on the globe, so this will be an aim of education at the first level. Then the more mature our

boys and girls are, the more we can spell out more detailed aims in three areas: knowledge, values and motivation.

ÅB: When you say values: What values would you especially think about in this context?

BR: I think that peace itself is a value, but it is not enough to describe it in this way. To make peace we need social justice, social care and other things which together mean peace. We have to develop those values in our students which make them able to create peace in a broad sense. This includes, for example, choosing non-violent ways of solving problems.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at peace education?

BR: Yes, there were some aspects, but I think most of them represent "negative education". When I finished my school in the 60s, we read many texts about the Second World War, and they created negative attitudes towards violence. I think it is quite important to educate in the negative way like this, but it is not enough.

ÅB: Since you mentioned the concept of patriotic education, was there in your school some emphasis on that?

BR: Yes. We had a special subject at school, preparation for the defence. The teacher explained modern armaments, and then he explained why we should protect our country – because we love our country – the emotional relation with the country was emphasized – because we must protect what we have built, because we must protect our tradition, our history.

ÅB: Was there a strong emphasis on this in your school?

BR: Yes, it was quite important.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

BR: Yes, I think they contribute, but not to the extent they should and they could. You know the Associated Schools Project of Unesco. We have it in Poland also, and I think this is quite an effective method for creating peace education. But unfortunately, there are just a few schools of this type, so I think that many of our schools do not use the possibilities they have.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

BR: Yes, I think it is possible. But schools need good programs for this kind of education, well-trained teachers and I think new methods also.

ÅB: What would be some of the things that you come to think of that a teacher could do in the classroom to promote peace education?

BR: Let's think about 16-17 age boys: The teacher can teach them how to solve conflicts in different ways. So when somebody sees something on TV, he is better equipped to evaluate this – he can evaluate the solutions. Maybe he feels that other solutions could be better. The teacher should emphasize that the world is not just one way. The student should see the world from a perspective of alternatives. Hopefully this makes people more flexible – they will be more ready to listen to the opinions of others.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

BR: I think the differences should adapt to the level of psychological development of the students. In kindergarten we should start to create positive emotions to different people – to people of different views, and to teach children to cooperate with different people – to teach them to be tolerant for differences. The more the pupils grow up, the more we should develop responsibility and motivation to act.

ÅB: What do you think could be done in the classroom to develop responsibility?

BR: I think that an important condition is to train the school pupils to decide what to do by themselves. When dealing with a poor country with many problems and a need of aid, the teacher can put the problem to the class: What can *we* do? We can not go there for instance and build houses, but we can do something. The pupils will forward suggestions, discuss and decide. Perhaps they decide to collect medicines after checking with a doctor. Perhaps they can invite a child for vacation.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that

subject?
BR: I thought about history and language. Let's take language. First, there is the decision to select the texts for those students. At this level they are quite mature, so we can choose different texts, not only from classical literature, but also from modern literature and even from journals about political matters – to develop the students' understanding of the world. And I think that quite a good method could be international contacts. I think that the average school can organize something for small groups. It's quite possible to invite a few students from another country and give them accommodation for three days. Such personal contacts can be good methods to change views and attitudes.
ÅB: You mentioned history also. What would you do in history?
BR: For me it is quite dangerous to make history simply a book of dates and other facts. I think instead that we should teach history as the process of changing things through human activity. Nothing in history happens without human decisions. If something is wrong now, we can change it to make it right. But we should avoid teaching our students dates and unrelated facts by heart – kings, presidents and battles.

8.
ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?
BR: For me peace education is the most general concept and "disarmament education" is a more limited area dealing with the negative side of peace education, for instance. "Education for international understanding and human rights" is also one part of peace education.
ÅB: Is peace education a common conception in your country?
BR: Yes.

9.
ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?
BR: I don't think we will meet many difficulties in school or with parents. I think that the experience of Poland proves that peace is the only way to live

and develop, but there may be some difficulties in handling peace education properly. For example, there is the danger of indoctrination; we must be careful not to show only one side of a problem or stressing only one solution as the correct one.

ÅB: Do you think that teachers would see some conflict between what you called patriotic education and peace education?

BR: Yes, they may feel some difficulty, I think.

ÅB: Is that something that has been discussed among teachers?

BR: I don't know very much about this. I think that the most important thing is the international situation. If it develops in a positive way, like now, without tensions, we can leave the defence problems and we can put more attention into peace education. But if there will be new tensions, the preparation of young people to deal with arms will again come into focus, and the conflict mentioned may be more obvious.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

BR: I think that the most important problem with teachers and also with school boys and girls is the feeling of helplessness. I have talked to many people about these issues, and they say: What can you do? You can do nothing about nuclear weapons. This is a very common feeling, and this feeling is also present among teachers. So first we have to create the feeling of being able to influence things. If the teacher will feel that he can change things, he will teach children in the same spirit. The next thing in my opinion is new programs for the schools. The programs of the schools are quite old now and not up-to-date.

ÅB: Would you say that today peace education is attended to in teacher training?

BR: I think usually it is not. I don't know the details, but I don't think it is important.

11.

ÅB: In many schools the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

BR: Poland is in a different situation than many other countries, because we are a fairly homogeneous nation. There are some small minorities, but we

see ourselves as one nation. So this is not a problem that teachers face every day, but there are some beginnings of this problem, and I think that in anticipation we should prepare teacher and children to be tolerant for people from other nations. We have now a very small immigration, but since the 70s Poland has opened windows and doors, so the situation will gradually change.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

BR: I think that the teacher should explain the problems and should show the possibilities to influence those two threats. The attitude should be: We are able to do something. The teacher should also show *different ways* of reacting: not only to protest but to contribute to solutions. The teacher should try to create situations that stimulate the students to develop activities. If we talk about pollution and environmental damage, planting new trees, for example, is an activity which can be undertaken in every school. It is important that the children feel they have done something.

ÅB: Is this question attended to in Polish schools at the present time?

BR: Yes, it's very important. It's very popular in mass media to talk about going from global challenges to local changes. There are many activities undertaken at the local level, for example, in cooperation with environmental groups, to protect the nature.

ÅB: Is that a recent thing in your country?

BR: Yes, I think it's quite a new thing.

13.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

BR: Yes, I think that we should further develop the system of the Unesco Associated Schools. We should make each school able to establish international contacts. International contacts is a very adequate method to use in peace education.

ÅB: If we go back to your own studies once more: What would be some of the more important findings that you have had in your surveys in relation

to peace education?

BR: One example is this: I have asked school boys in which areas of life you feel you can make a change and in which you can not. I wanted to describe their image of empowerment and powerlessness – where they feel they can do something and where they feel that they cannot. For instance, with respect to peace in the world they answered: we can do nothing – our influence is very low. Disarmament: we can do nothing. But international contacts: we can do a lot. Development of national culture in the spirit of peace: we can do a lot. Changes in our school: we can do a lot. Changes in our work: we can do a lot. So the general picture seems to be: the feeling of empowerment is strongest in the closest life circles, but when we go out into the international world, this feeling goes down. This tells us, I think, where to start peace education – we should start where young people feel they can do something: at family, at school, at work, at youth exchange, cultural activities.

Another thing from the results which is in my opinion very important is this. I ask the students questions like: How do you feel in the present world – do you feel secure? Do you feel threatened? Do you feel helpless? Most of them felt threatened and helpless in the face of the dangers of nuclear war and also in relation to the dangers of pollution. We get a quite pessimistic view when more than 60 % of the young population tell you they feel threatened and helpless. What responsibility will they take? Of course, we can doubt the results of a questionnaire. But I think that this result pattern is quite important. The feeling is real – the young people told me what they felt. And it should be important to deal with this situation.

ISSN 0479-7736